DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 151 SP 009 924

AUTHOR Daunt, Patrick D.; Redburn, Dennis
TITLE The Indiana Student Teaching Study.
INSTITUTION Indiana Association of Teacher Educators.; Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 119p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Cooperating Teachers; Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; School Surveys; *Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Indiana

ABSTRACT

This study investigated what student teachers, supervising teachers, and school administrators throughout the state of Indiana felt about the contributions of student teaching programs. The questionnaires sent to each group are included, and responses are cross-tabulated to examine agreement or disagreement between groups. Questions examined include (1) the effects of student teachers on the instructional program of the schools; (2) the contributions of student teachers to the schools; (3) the effects of the presence of student teachers on the responsibilities, workloads, and time of supervising teachers and administrators; (4) the effects of the presence of student teachers on other school personnel; (5) supervision of student teachers; (6) the perception of teacher education programs by people involved with them; (7) the effectiveness of support services provided by colleges and universities; and (8) implications for future teacher education programs. Results indicated that student teachers enhance the educational programs in which they do their student teaching. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patrick D. Daunt
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

THE INDIANA

STUDENT TEACHING STUDY

SP009 924

Conducted by the Indiana Association of
Teacher Educators in cooperation with the
Indiana State Department of Public Instruction
Harold H. Negley, Superintendent

©Indiana Association of Teacher Educators 1975

Library of Congress
A 705971

Additional copies of this report may be ordered
at cost from:

Patrick D. Daunt or Dennis Redburn
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

FOREWORD

The one most critical experience provided for propective teachers is student teaching. Even the harshest critics of professional teacher preparation programs support inservice pre-certification experiences for teachers in training. In fact, an examination of the literature in teacher education reveals that strong support of this premise has been evident for several decades.

As teacher training programs in colleges and universities grew (almost without control) during the '50s and '60s, greater and greater efforts were made to expand the student teaching experience. As it developed from a cursory part-time experience into an all-day assignment stretching over several months, the pressures to provide student teachers with quality experiences grew for both the institutions of higher education and the thousands of public schools that provided the student teaching setting. Though the growth rate of teacher education programs has abated somewhat within the last few years, the necessity of obtaining quality placements for each student teacher continues to place specific demands upon Indiana schools.

The commitment of Indiana educators to helping prepare new professionals in the field of teaching is representative of developments in teacher preparation throughout the United States. Untold numbers of hours are expended each year by teachers, supervisors and administrators in providing the public school component of the student teaching program, a required offering of every accredited institution of teacher preparation in the state. And, each day thousands of university students spend an increasingly large proportion of their professional program time in public school classrooms. This enormous investment of time at all levels of the Indiana teacher preparation programs reinforces several basic operating assumptions:

1. Only through direct and extended live experiences in "real school settings" can students be adequately prepared for entrance into the profession;

2. The realistic experience of student teaching has provided positive contributions to the teaching quality of pre-certification candidates;

3. There is an intrinsic value in testing theory in a real school setting, and

4. The costly commitment of personnel, time and financial support are justified.

As a result of the assignment of student teachers to virtually every public school in the state, the number of children who interact daily with pre-professionals is staggering. The growing number of persons affected by the many aspects of teacher preparation makes careful monitoring and improvement of the programs increasingly important. As partners in the teacher education experience, the universities and public schools must constantly examine the responsibilities and commitments inherent in their cooperation so that the primary goals of neither institution are imposed upon by the other. Pertinent questions which can be asked are:

1. *What is the impact experienced by public schools as a result of the assignment of pre-professional teachers to the classrooms?* Other questions stemming from this inquiry probe impact upon curriculum, inservice development of teachers and children taught.

2. *Are the arrangements presently in operation "truly" cooperative?* This question of mutuality is particularly important and must be approached from the perspectives of personnel in all institutions involved.

3. *How can direct laboratory experiences and their attendant inter-institutional relationships be strengthened as Indiana teacher education programs move into the 1980s?*

Numerous efforts were made to evaluate the quality of student teaching experiences during their rapid growth in the '50s and '60s. The literature of that day is flooded with reports of such attempts. However, teacher preparation institutions and public schools were fully engaged in simply meeting the demands of this flourishing group of pre-professionals, and only minimal time could be devoted to reporting those experiences. Most research from this period was conducted wholly from the perspective of the teacher

preparation institutions. To balance out the research angle and provide insight in[illegible] the questions listed above, the Indiana Association of Teacher Educat[illegible]nd the Indiana Department of Public Instruction initiated the stat[illegible]esearch which is presented here, "The Indiana Student Teaching Study."

Anne Patterson, Director
Division of Teacher Education and Certification

Jean Merritt, Associate Superintendent
Indiana Department of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background 1

Purpose 2

Procedures 3

- Population
- Steering Committee
- Instruments
- Distribution
- Analysis of Data

Summary of Findings 5

Sample Analysis 6

- Conclusions
- Summary

Questionnaire Instructions 13

Student Teacher Questionnaire 15

Teacher Questionnaire 45

Administrator Questionnaire 75

Appendix A – Cross-Tabulation of Items 107

Appendix B – Selected Items Related to Study Questions 113

Acknowledgments 117

Background

In 1970, the cooperative arrangements between institutions involved with Indiana's student teaching programs emerged as a major concern of the Indiana Association of Teacher Educators (ATE-I). At the autumn Turkey Run Teacher Education Workshop that year, the executive committee of ATE-I began discussing these arrangements in a very general way.

The partnership arrangement for the student teaching programs had apparently progressed quite well for several years from the point of view of the teacher preparation institutions. The committee felt that student teachers were getting outstanding preparatory experience. At the same time, however, they had no indication of how the presence of these pre-professionals affected the educational programs in the schools. No real data were available either to support their beliefs or to assess the growing relationships between the public schools and the teacher preparation institutions. Already, public schools were beginning to assume additional responsibility in preparing emerging teachers.

Committee members realized that this increased involvement mandated broader-based cooperation not only for the institutions involved, but for state departments, professional organizations and other agencies as well. In Michigan, a study had just been published which examined the impact of student teachers on schools there. The executive committee decided that research into the cooperative arrangements of teacher preparation could effectively probe several related issues: the effect of student teachers on public school educational programs; the degree of mutuality between the institutions cooperating in the teacher preparation programs, and the development of stronger communications and cooperation at all levels of the teacher preparation programs.

For the next two years, discussion of the proposed research continued with teacher preparation personnel in the schools, directors of student teaching and clinical experiences, several professional organizations and other interested parties. Everyone consulted favored the study, but funding such a pervasive project loomed as a major problem. In the meantime, enrollments were increasing to meet the demands for more teachers, a revision of Indiana teacher certification standards (Bulletin 400) was being discussed, and the profession was moving steadily toward true partnership responsibilities in teacher preparation.

By early 1973, the proposed statewide study of student teaching had gathered enough support to merit action. At the spring meeting of ATE-I, Dennis Redburn and James Yutzy were appointed co-directors of the study, and Patrick Daunt accepted the responsibility of research director.

Using the Michigan research as a model, preliminary planning began. Many hours were spent during this phase investigating possible funding support, laying basic procedural and logistic groundwork, setting overall objectives and gathering additional direction from colleagues in teacher education. Uppermost in the minds of the planners was the idea of *cooperation.* It was concern for the cooperative nature of the teacher preparation program which had stimulated discussion of the project in the first place, and it would be cooperation which would guarantee the broad input and participation essential to a successful statewide study.

In the autumn of 1973, the State Department of Public Instruction agreed to co-sponsor the study. Through the cooperation of Superintendent Harold H. Negley, Mrs. Jean Merritt and Mrs. Anne Patterson the Department committed funding and logistical support to the study, and the "Indiana Student Teaching Study" was born.

Purpose

This study was designed to determine the effects of student teaching programs on the cooperating schools by investigating the perceptions of cooperating school personnel and student teachers on the following questions:

- What are the effects of student teachers on the instructional program of the school?
- What are the contributions of student teachers to the schools?
- What are the effects of the presence of student teachers on the responsibilities, work loads and time of supervising teachers and administrators?
- What are the effects of the presence of student teachers on other school personnel?

- What is the nature of the student teaching experience?
- How are student teachers supervised?
- What are the demographic charactertistics of the respondents in the study?
- How are teacher education programs perceived?
- How effective are the support services which are provided by colleges and universities?
- What are the implications for future teacher education programs?

Procedures

Population

The nature of student teaching assignments and the variety of student teaching experiences throughout the state prohibited a systematic random sampling of the population. Therefore, the entire student teaching population in the State of Indiana was surveyed during the autumn of 1974. All of their supervising teachers and all school administrators of the buildings in which student teachers were assigned were asked to complete the survey.

A total of 4,952 individuals responded to the survey. Of these, 2,157 were student teachers, 2,046 were supervising teachers and 749 were school administrators.

Steering Committee

The executive committee of ATE-I appointed a Student Teaching Study Steering Committee in early 1974 to assist in developing instruments and procedures for the study. The committee, representing nearly every type of teacher preparation institution in the state and involving individuals from the various geographic regions of the state, worked with the research director, Patrick Daunt, throughout the study.

Instruments

With the Michigan Impact Study as a model, the steering committee developed separate questionnaires for students teachers, teachers and administrators for use in Indiana's study. Every teacher preparation institution in the state was invited to critique the instruments and offer suggestions as they were developed, and care was taken to develop them in parallel form (see Appendix A for cross-tabulation). All respondents were assured anonymity, and no attempt was made to match student teachers with their supervisors or school administrators.

The first set of questionnaires was field tested during the spring of 1974, and a pilot study was conducted during the summer with revised documents. Prior to the pilot study, the early instruments were studied by numerous classroom teachers, students teachers and school administrators, and many of their suggestions were incorporated into the pilot-study questionnaire. As a result, the administrator questionnaire was broadened to include any school administrator who in the judgment of the college supervisor would have sufficient contacts with the student teaching program to provide insights about it. The school administrator category expanded to include not only school principals, but all central office personnel, curriculum supervisors and department chairpersons.

Distribution

The questionnaires were administered during the latter part of the student teaching experience in the autumn of 1974. Representatives from each teacher preparation institution coordinated the distribution and collection of materials for their institutions. Every effort was made to insure that each questionnaire was delivered to the respondent personally and that it was collected in the same manner. Untold numbers of university and college supervisors provided these services.

It was apparent from the outset of the project that the key determinant of success was to be cooperation. Every teacher preparation institution in the state agreed to cooperate in the study; however, a few did not have student teachers in the laboratory setting during this time period. More than 80 per cent of all potential respondents (student teacher, teachers and administrators) did respond to the survey. The cooperation from supervising

teachers and administrators was outstanding.

Analysis of Data

All data sheets were processed at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. The report of the data shows the percentage responding to a particular choice and the number responding to each choice. The questionnaires with these figures are included in the report. Omitted answers and the rounding of numbers occasionally cause the percentages for each question to total more or less than 100.

The approach taken in this report is to provide the reader with the opportunity to analyze the data as presented. As a result of the high proportion of the population responding, valid conclusions can be drawn from the data as reported. Where further and more precise analysis is warranted, the data can be made available to interested persons.

Summary of Findings

The data appear to support the conclusion that student teachers enhance the educational programs of the schools in which they do their student teaching. For instance, over 94 per cent of the school administrators and over 90 per cent of the supervising teachers reported that their schools benefited in some way from the presence of student teachers. In particular, a vast majority of supervising teachers and school administrators reported that student teachers had either a positive impact upon or did not alter or inhibit the educational program for the pupils of the schools.

Yet, it is the intent of this report to guide the reader in his analysis by identifying the initial questions the study sought to investigate and the particular items which relate to these questions rather than to report conclusions. In addition, there are numerous additional questions imbedded in the data which deserve further analysis. The reader is encouraged to select questions of interest to him for further analysis.

The questions this study investigated are listed in Appendix B with a listing of selected items (chosen by a panel of experts) which relate directly to the question. The committee did choose to present one of these questions here as an example of how the interpretation might proceed.

Sample Analysis

How effective are the support services which are provided by colleges and universities?

The items chosen for analysis of this question are: Student Teacher Questionnaire Items 80, 81, 82 and 83; Teacher Questionnaire Items 80, 81, 82, 83 and 84, and Administrator Questionnaire Items 80 and 81. It is important to note that these items have been identified as being *primarily* related to this question. Undoubtedly, there are additional items which can also be related to it.

Analysis will be simplified through use of Appendix A. Appendix A indicates Questions 80 and 81 are similar on all three questionnaires, and Items 82 and 83 on the Student Teacher and Teacher Questionnaires are similar. Additional items which were identified as being primarily related include Item 84 on the Teacher Questionnaire. (Items 54 through 63 on the Administrator Questionnaire are closely related to the analysis of support services provided by the colleges and universities, but these items will not be included in this analysis.)

All three groups of respondents were asked to indicate how much help the university supervisor provided. The question varied to the extent that student teachers and supervising teachers were asked to indicate how much help was provided to them, and administrators were asked to indicate how much help was provided to all three groups. These responses are reported in Table I.

Over half of each group indicated that the university supervisor had provided all the help that was necessary. In addition, 72.9 per cent of the student teachers, 84 per cent of the teachers and 77.4 per cent of the administrators reported that the university supervisor provided all or most of the help needed.

An inspection of Table I reveals that only one teacher and one student teacher reported that the university supervisor refused help. It is also reported that 3.5 per cent of the student teachers, 1.9 per cent of the teachers and 0.3 per cent of the administrators indicated that none of the help that was needed was provided.

In a related question, the three groups of respondents were asked to identify the extent to which the university supervisor was available. Their responses are reported in Table II.

As reported in Table II, 86.2 per cent of the student teachers indicated that the availability of the university supervisor was either adequate or very adequate. Also, 89.7 per cent of the supervising teachers and 91.6 per cent of the administrators reported that the availability of the university supervisor was either adequate or very adequate. By contrast, 13.7 per cent of the student teachers, 10.4 per cent of the teachers and 8.2 per cent of the administrators reported that the availability of the university supervisor was less than adequate or very inadequate.

Student teachers and teachers were asked to report the number of times the university supervisor visited the student teacher's classes. As reported in Table III, 2.9 per cent of the students and 2.9 per cent of the teachers reported the university supervisor never visited. Also, 23 per cent of the student teachers and 20.8 per cent of the teachers reported that the university supervisor had visited the student teacher's classroom five or more times.

Supervising teachers and student teachers were also asked to report the total number of contacts they had had with the university supervisor. An inspection of Table IV reveals that 70.7 per cent of the student teachers and 37.9 per cent of the supervising teachers reported they had five or more contacts with the university supervisor. Among the remaining supervising teachers, 44.4 per cent reported three or four contacts with the university supervisor, 16.1 per cent reported one or two contacts, and 1.4 per cent reported that they had no contacts with the university supervisor.

Supervising teachers were also asked if the university coordinator had been helpful with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching. As reported in Table V, 42.1 per cent of these supervising teachers indicated that the university coordinator either helped when asked or went out of the way to be helpful. Only one supervising teacher reported that the university coordinator had refused to help when asked, and 5 per cent reported the university coordinator had been no help.

Conclusions

Most student teachers felt they had had all or most of the help they needed; the supervising teachers and administrators concurred in this conclusion. University supervisors were reported to be available to both

TABLE I: HELP PROVIDED BY THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR

	All		Most		Some	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Teacher	1,166	54.8	385	18.1	306	14.4
Teacher	1,416	70.2	278	13.8	177	8.8
Administrator	371	50.1	202	27.3	93	12.6
TOTAL	2,953	60.5	865	17.7	576	11.8

TABLE II: EXTENT TO WHICH UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR WAS AVAILABLE

	Very Adequate		Adequate	
	N	%	N	%
Student Teacher	758	35.6	1077	50.6
Teacher	801	39.4	1023	50.3
Administrator	195	26.2	486	65.4
TOTAL	1754	35.8	2586	52.7

Little		Refused		None		Total	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
194	9.1	1	.0	74	3.5	2126	43.5
106	5.3	1	.0	39	1.9	2017	41.3
28	3.8	45	6.1*	2	0.3	741	15.2
328	6.7	47	.9*	115	2.4	4884	100.0

*Administrators were not asked if help was refused. The figures reported for the administrators in this column are their responses indicating they didn't know how much help was provided.

Less Than Adequate		Very Inadequate		Totals	
N	%	N	%	N	%
221	10.4	70	3.3	2126	43.4
162	8.0	48	2.4	2034	41.5
54	7.3	7	0.9	742	15.2
437	8.9	125	2.5	4902	100.0

TABLE III: CLASSROOM VISITS BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS

	None		1 to 2		3 to 4		5 to 6	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Teacher	62	2.9	547	25.7	1027	48.3	268	12.6
Teacher	58	2.9	498	24.7	1038	51.5	269	13.3
TOTAL	120	2.9	1045	25.2	2065	49.9	537	13.0

TABLE IV: TOTAL CONTACTS WITH UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR

	None		1 or 2		3 or 4		5 or 6	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Teacher	24	1.1	157	7.4	443	20.8	511	24.0
Teacher	29	1.4	328	16.1	903	44.4	449	22.1
TOTAL	53	1.3	485	11.7	1346	32.4	960	23.1

TABLE V: UNIVERSITY COORDINATOR HELP WITH OTHER MATTERS

	Went Out of the Way		Helped When Asked	
	N	%	N	%
Teacher	419	20.6	437	21.5

7 to 8		9 to 10		11 to 12		13 to 14		15 or more		Totals	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
117	5.5	53	2.5	15	0.7	18	0.8	20	0.9	2127	51.3
82	4.1	48	2.4	10	0.5	6	8.3	7	0.2	2016	48.7
199	4.8	101	2.4	25	0.6	24	0.6	27	0.7	4143	100.0

7 or 8		9 or 10		11 or 12		13 or 14		15 or more		Totals	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
331	15.6	223	10.5	99	4.7	69	3.2	270	12.7	2127	51.1
193	9.5	68	3.3	29	1.4	14	0.7	19	0.9	2032	48.9
524	12.6	291	7.0	128	3.1	83	2.0	289	7.0	4159	100.00

No Help Needed		No Help		Refused		Totals	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1076	52.9	102	5.0	1	0.5	2035	100.0

student teachers, supervising teachers and administrators. There were relatively few respondents from any group who reported that the university supervisors provided no help or that they were not available. A substantial number of both student teachers and supervising teachers indicated that the help provided and the availability of the university supervisor were less than desirable.

Both student teachers and teachers reported that the vast majority of student teachers were visited in their classrooms three or more times. Also, over 90 per cent of the student teachers and over 80 per cent of the supervising teachers reported they had three or more contacts with the university supervisor. In addition, a large number of supervising teachers reported they had received assistance from the university supervisor concerning matters other than student teaching business.

Generally, it appears that the university supervisors are providing most of the assistance needed to student teachers and supervisors. The university supervisor is available and does have an adequate number of contacts with both student teachers and supervising teachers. Yet, nearly 14 per cent of the student teachers and more than 10 per cent of the supervising teachers reported that the university supervisor was not adequately available. Also, many student teachers and supervising teachers reported that the university supervisor was of little help or of no help.

It does appear that the teacher preparation institutions of the state provide most of the support services desired by their student teachers and the cooperating supervising teachers. There is a continued need to improve these services and the communication patterns about their availability through inservice programs with university supervisors and supervising teachers.

Summary

This sample analysis of one of the major study questions provides one possible model for additional analyses of the data. Appendix B will also prove useful for further analyses of the major questions and other significant issues.

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

The Indiana Department of Public Instruction and the Indiana unit of the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE-I) are co-sponsoring a study: "Student Teaching in Indiana." The overriding purposes are to ascertain the impact of student teaching programs and student teachers on the schools of Indiana and to obtain input from all phases of the operation for future guidance and direction. The overall goal is to attempt to determine, through the descriptive questionnaire technique, ways pre-service teacher preparation can be improved. This is a monumental task and will need the cooperation of many people throughout the state. Any schools that are working with student teaching programs and all teacher preparation institutions are being asked to participate.

Directions to Respondents

1. Use the IBM answer sheet provided. Do not identify yourself or your school by name. There will be no way for your specific answer sheet to be identified once you turn it in.

2. Use a No. 2 or No. 2½ pencil and mark only *one* space for each item to indicate your answer. Be careful not to put any other marks on the answer sheet.

3. Note that the answer spaces alternate from the left to the right column of the answer sheet.

4. Mark no more than one answer for each item. Please answer every item.

5. In the instrument, "university" means either college or university. "Supervising teacher" also means cooperating teacher, classroom teacher or critic teacher. "College supervisor" means university supervisor, college coordinator or the representative from the student teaching office.

Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Steering Committee for
Indiana Student Teaching Survey

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE*

1. Which of the following best describes you?

65.2%	1399	1.	a single student
34.7%	745	2.	a married student teacher

2. How old were you at the beginning of this student teaching assignment?

51.4%	1103	1.	21 years or under
21.7%	465	2.	22 years
7.6%	163	3.	23 years
3.8%	82	4.	24 years
2.5%	54	5.	25 years
6.4%	138	6.	26 to 30 years
3.0%	64	7.	31 to 35 years
1.9%	40	8.	36 to 40 years
1.7%	36	9.	over 40 years

3. Which statement below best describes the community in which your school is located?

13.7%	292	1.	large central city (population over 150,000)
15.7%	333	2.	large suburban community (population over 25,000)
13.7%	290	3.	small suburban community (population 25,000 or less)
22.8%	484	4.	medium sized city (population between 50,000 to 150,000)
34.1%	725	5.	small city or rural area (population less than 50,000

* The percentage of the total number who responded on each item is reported for each item choice. The other figure is the number who responded for each item choice. Please note that the total number responding to an item does vary, as every respondent did not answer every question.

4. What was your status as a student in your college or university when you began this student teaching assignment?

.0%	0	1.	had sophomore standing
1.4%	31	2.	had junior standing
91.6%	1975	3.	had senior standing
5.9%	127	4.	completed the BA or BS degree
1.1%	24	5.	other

5. What is your cumulative grade point average? (A=4.0, B=3.0, C=2.0, D=1.0, F=0)

.3%	6	1.	below 2.0
10.7%	231	2.	2.0 to 2.49
32.5%	699	3.	2.5 to 2.99
36.8%	791	4.	3.0 to 3.49
19.7%	424	5.	3.5 or above

6. What is your sex?

26.2%	561	1.	male
73.8%	1583	2.	female

7. What type of school are you assigned to for student teaching?

96.8%	2011	1.	public school
2.4%	49	2.	private school
.2%	5	3.	laboratory school
.3%	7	4.	special service institution (e.g., reformatory, penal institution)
.3%	6	5.	other

8. How many weeks long is your current assignment?

.9%	19	1.	5 weeks or less
9.3%	199	2.	6 or 7 weeks
40.2%	865	3.	8 or 9 weeks
22.3%	479	4.	10 or 11 weeks
7.4%	159	5.	12 or 14 weeks
19.9%	428	6.	more than 14 weeks

9. At this time, how many weeks are left in your student teaching assignment?

5.5%	118	1.	5 or more weeks
6.0%	128	2.	4 weeks
8.5%	182	3.	3 weeks
13.5%	290	4.	2 weeks
21.2%	456	5.	1 week
45.1%	968	6.	none

10. In this assignment, how much time per day were you scheduled in student teaching?

90.9%	1931	1.	full days
8.5%	180	2.	half days
.6%	13	3.	less than half days

11. In this assignment, how were you placed?

77.5%	1646	1.	with a single supervising teacher
8.9%	190	2.	in a team-teaching situation (two or more team-teachers)
13.5%	286	3.	with two or more different teachers (but not team-teaching)

12. Which of the following best describes the instructional setting in which you were placed for this assignment?

68.2%	1452	1.	a self-contained or conventional classroom
2.8%	60	2.	a pod arrangement
6.1%	129	3.	open space school
4.5%	96	4.	individualized instructional setting
4.7%	101	5.	team-teaching
8.1%	172	6.	a flexible modular or variable scheduled program
5.5%	118	7.	a special school arrangement different from any of the above

13. What is your principal current student teaching assignment?

28.3%	606	1.	primary grades
15.2%	325	2.	intermediate grades
6.5%	140	3.	all elementary grades
2.6%	56	4.	middle school
9.7%	208	5.	junior high school
31.7%	680	6.	senior high school
3.8%	82	7.	junior high/middle school and senior high
1.4%	29	8.	elementary and secondary combination
.7%	16	9.	all grades K-12

14. To what extent were you assigned to student teach in your major or minor certification areas?

81.2%	1726	1.	all in major
1.6%	33	2.	all in minor
3.4%	73	3.	approximately 75% in major and 25% in minor
6.4%	135	4.	about half in major and half in minor
1.0%	22	5.	approximately 75% in minor and 25% in major
3.5%	74	6.	basically assigned to major area, but also assigned to another area (but not minor area)
2.9%	62	7.	don't know

Questions 15 through 18:*
To what subject area or teaching field were you primarily assigned for student teaching? (Mark only one answer from items 15, 16, 17, 18)

15.	.7%	17	1.	agriculture
	4.4%	108	2.	arts and crafts
	1.8%	45	3.	biology
	1.6%	40	4.	business education
	.2%	5	5.	business administration
	.5%	13	6.	chemistry
	1.9%	46	7.	distributive education
	.9%	21	8.	earth science

* Percentages reported for items 15 through 18 are based on the total number of responses to all four items. Also, a larger total N is indicated by the number of responses due to respondent error.

16.	3.5%	85	1.	home economics
	1.6%	40	2.	industrial arts
	.3%	7	3.	journalism
	6.9%	150	4.	mathematics
	3.9%	96	5.	music
	5.1%	124	6.	English
	2.9%	70	7.	foreign language
	.9%	22	8.	general science
17.	1.2%	28	1.	health and safety
	.7%	17	2.	school library and audio-visual services
	7.5%	184	3.	social studies
	1.1%	26	4.	speech
	.2%	4	5.	vocational business and office education
	.5%	13	6.	vocational trade and industrial education
	8.0%	194	7.	physical education
	.1%	2	8.	physics
18.	.5%	11	1.	radio and television
	.1%	2	2.	recreation
	2.1%	51	3.	kindergarten
	35.9%	876	4.	elementary
	.1%	2	5.	nursery school
	4.3%	104	6.	special education
	1.3%	31	7.	speech and hearing therapy
	.3%	7	8.	junior high school endorsement

Questions 19 through 24:
In your perception, to what extent were any of the following activities for pupils changed as a result of your presence?

19. The extent your supervising teacher worked with individuals pupils.

13.2%	282	1. much more than usual
23.4%	502	2. somewhat more than usual
30.7%	657	3. about the same as usual
13.0%	278	4. somewhat less than usual
16.7%	357	5. much less than usual
3.1%	66	6. don't know

20. Individual help or counseling provided to pupils during non-class hours.

6.2%	133	1. much more than usual
17.8%	380	2. somewhat more than usual
56.1%	1196	3. about the same as usual
4.5%	97	4. somewhat less than usual
3.5%	75	5. much less than usual
11.8%	251	6. don't know

21. Amount of small group instruction.

15.2%	325	1. much more than usual
28.5%	612	2. somewhat more than usual
42.7%	916	3. about the same as usual
4.9%	104	4. somewhat less than usual
3.8%	81	5. much less than usual
4.9%	106	6. don't know

22. Provision for make-up work and follow-up of exams.

7.2%	152	1. much more than usual
19.0%	404	2. somewhat more than usual
57.5%	1221	3. about the same as usual
3.4%	72	4. somewhat less than usual
3.5%	74	5. much less than usual
9.5%	201	6. don't know

23. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.

16.2%	347	1. much more than usual
33.6%	720	2. somewhat more than usual
37.7%	807	3. about the same as usual
4.8%	103	4. somewhat less than usual
3.5%	74	5. much less than usual
4.2%	89	6. don't know

24. Progress of students toward curricular goals.

8.2%	174	1. much more than usual
23.9%	508	2. somewhat more than usual
55.0%	1169	3. about the same as usual
2.9%	61	4. somewhat less than usual
1.5%	32	5. much less than usual
8.6%	183	6. don't know

Questions 25 through 28:
To what extent were any of the following changed as a result of your presence?

25. Supervision of noninstructional activities (bus duty, recess, playground, hallways, lunch duty, etc.).

5.5%	118	1.	much better
14.1%	301	2.	somewhat better
60.4%	1294	3.	no change
.9%	19	4.	somewhat poorer
.3%	6	5.	much poorer
15.8%	338	6.	does not apply
3.1%	66	7.	don't know

26. Motivation of pupils.

12.0%	257	1.	much better
47.9%	1027	2.	somewhat better
30.4%	652	3.	no change
2.7%	57	4.	somewhat poorer
.3%	6	5.	much poorer
.7%	14	6.	does not apply
6.1%	131	7.	don't know

27. Supervision of in-class study time.

12.9%	275	1.	much better
28.6%	610	2.	somewhat better
41.5%	885	3.	no change
4.9%	105	4.	somewhat poorer
.5%	11	5.	much poorer
8.4%	179	6.	does not apply
3.2%	69	7.	don't know

28. Maintenance of effective learning environment.

11.2%	239	1.	much better
33.7%	721	2.	somewhat better
44.2%	946	3.	no change
5.8%	125	4.	somewhat poorer
.5%	10	5.	much poorer
.8%	18	6.	does not apply
3.8%	81	7.	don't know

Questions 29 through 34:
How often did you make specific contributions to the school, pupils, or teachers, such as:

29. Supervise non-instructional activities (recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground, or hall duty)?

27.6%	593	1.	frequently
18.9%	405	2.	often
21.7%	466	3.	sometimes
11.6%	250	4.	seldom
18.6%	400	5.	never
1.5%	32	6.	don't know

30. Bring, develop, provide or suggest any new or different instructional materials or ideas?

19.4%	416	1.	frequently
32.9%	705	2.	often
39.2%	840	3.	sometimes
7.0%	150	4.	seldom
1.1%	24	5.	never
.4%	9	6.	don't know

31. Were your contributions to the school program used?

16.8%	359	1.	frequently
27.9%	595	2.	often
36.2%	772	3.	sometimes
5.0%	106	4.	seldom
3.6%	77	5.	never
10.4%	221	6.	don't know

32. How often did you work with (e.g., instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

38.5%	822	1.	frequently
29.7%	633	2.	often
23.3%	498	3.	sometimes
6.5%	138	4.	seldom
1.6%	35	5.	never
.3%	7	6.	don't know

33. How often do you feel that planning and conferring with you took the time of the teacher so there was less time for individual work with pupils?

.7%	15	1.	frequently
2.8%	61	2.	often
8.4%	181	3.	sometimes
35.0%	752	4.	seldom
50.8%	1091	5.	never
2.2%	47	6.	don't know

34. How often was it necessary for the supervising teacher to re-teach after you taught?

.5%	11	1. frequently
.8%	16	2. often
2.3%	50	3. sometimes
19.5%	416	4. seldom
71.6%	1526	5. never
5.2%	110	6. don't know

35. To what extent do you feel your supervising teacher and school benefited from your presence as a student teacher?

40.6%	867	1. a great deal
48.5%	1034	2. somewhat
1.9%	40	3. not at all
9.0%	192	4. don't know

36. To what extent did you assume the teaching load of your supervising teacher(s)? (at the maximum)

76.1%	1608	1. 80-100%
13.3%	280	2. 60-79%
7.9%	167	3. 40-59%
2.3%	48	4. 20-39%
.4%	9	5. less than 20%

37. At what point in time during your student teaching experience did you assume your maximum teaching load?

11.8%	254	1.	assumed the maximum immediately (first week)
32.4%	697	2.	during the first one-fourth of the experience
23.9%	514	3.	during the second quarter of the experience
23.5%	507	4.	during the third quarter of the experience
8.4%	181	5.	after the third quarter of the experience

38. How many hours per week on the average was your supervising teacher away from the classroom while you were teaching his assigned classes?

7.8%	168	1.	less than 1 hour
22.4%	482	2.	1-5 hours
19.8%	425	3.	6-10 hours
20.3%	436	4.	11-15 hours
16.3%	350	5.	16-20 hours
13.5%	290	6.	more than 20 hours

39. To what extent did your supervising teacher appear inconvenienced by your presence for student teaching?

1.5%	33	1.	a great deal
9.8%	211	2.	somewhat
81.0%	1738	3.	not at all
7.7%	165	4.	don't know

Questions 40 through 44:
As best as you can determine, how often did your supervising teacher engage in any of the following additional activities during the time you were teaching his assigned classes?

40. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

2.8%	61	1.	frequently
5.8%	125	2.	often
21.4%	459	3.	sometimes
21.0%	451	4.	seldom
40.5%	869	5.	never
8.4%	180	6.	don't know

41. Meeting with faculty and staff in committees or conferences.

6.9%	149	1.	frequently
12.9%	278	2.	often
33.3%	716	3.	sometimes
22.0%	473	4.	seldom
16.7%	360	5.	never
8.1%	174	6.	don't know

42. Research, curriculum development, professional reading or writing.

10.7%	230	1.	frequently
20.1%	431	2.	often
26.9%	577	3.	sometimes
15.3%	328	4.	seldom
16.2%	347	5.	never
10.8%	231	6.	don't know

43. Participated in supervising teacher seminars or other inservice activities dealing with student teaching.

2.8%	61	1. frequently
4.1%	88	2. often
13.7%	295	3. sometimes
16.7%	360	4. seldom
46.8%	1006	5. never
15.8%	340	6. don't know

44. Assisted the principal or other teachers.

7.6%	163	1. frequently
13.0%	279	2. often
28.8%	618	3. sometimes
18.5%	397	4. seldom
18.6%	399	5. never
13.4%	288	6. don't know

45. How often did you teach for other regular staff members who did not have student teachers?

2.0%	44	1. frequently
2.7%	59	2. often
11.1%	239	3. sometimes
17.0%	366	4. seldom
67.1%	1444	5. never

46. How often did you supervise non-instructional activities (e.g., lunch duty, study halls, playground, chaperoning, coaching, etc.) for other regular staff members who did not have student teachers?

7.3%	156	1. frequently
5.5%	118	2. often
12.1%	261	3. sometimes
16.2%	349	4. seldom
58.7%	1262	5. never

47. How often were staff members, other than your supervising teacher, able to visit in other classrooms or schools because of your presence in the building?

2.2%	47	1. frequently
3.9%	83	2. often
13.1%	278	3. sometimes
17.2%	364	4. seldom
63.1%	1339	5. never

48. How often were staff members, other than your supervising teacher, able to engage in research, curriculum development, professional reading, writing, or committee work because of your presence in the building?

2.1%	44	1. frequently
4.3%	90	2. often
13.2%	280	3. sometimes
14.8%	313	4. seldom
65.2%	1378	5. never

49. On how many occasions was your supervising teacher used to fill in for other teachers where normally, if you were not teaching the supervisor's classes, a substitute would have been called?

68.5%	1462	1. none
12.5%	266	2. 1 time
11.9%	253	3. 2 or 3 times
4.6%	99	4. 4 or 5 times
1.3%	27	5. 6 or 7 times
.6%	13	6. 8 or 9 times
.7%	14	7. 10 or more times

50. Approximately how many hours per week were you in the physical presence of your supervising teacher *during* your first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

6.7%	142	1.	less than 10 hours
16.0%	340	2.	11-20 hours
26.1%	555	3.	21-30 hours
33.8%	719	4.	31-40 hours
17.4%	371	5.	more than 40 hours

51. Approximately how many hours per week were you in the physical presence of your supervising teacher *after* your first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

22.5%	480	1.	less than 10 hours
31.0%	661	2.	11-20 hours
23.5%	501	3.	21-30 hours
14.8%	315	4.	31-40 hours
8.3%	177	5.	more than 40 hours

52. How did your presence as a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week your supervising teacher spent at school as compared to when he does not have a student teacher?

10.3%	222	1.	reduced by 1 to 3 hours
6.9%	148	2.	reduced by more than 3 hours
67.3%	1447	3.	had no effect
3.0%	65	4.	added 1 to 3 hours
.6%	12	5.	added more than 3 hours
11.9%	256	6.	unable to judge

53. How clearly was your role of authority defined by your supervising teacher?

34.7%	748	1. more than adequately
51.6%	1113	2. adequately
9.6%	207	3. less than adequately
3.9%	84	4. very inadequately

54. To what extent did you assume the extracurricular responsibilities of your supervising teacher(s)?

15.2%	326	1. frequently
15.3%	327	2. often
27.7%	593	3. sometimes
18.8%	403	4. seldom
23.0%	493	5. never

55. How adequately informed were you regarding the legal status of a student teacher?

13.9%	297	1. more than adequately
51.5%	1104	2. adequately
25.0%	535	3. less than adequately
9.2%	197	4. very inadequately

Questions 56 and 57:
How frequently did your supervising teacher observe your teaching of the classes?

56. *During* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

2.6%	55	1.	not at all
11.5%	247	2.	no more than 2 to 3 hours per week
11.8%	253	3.	about one-fourth of the time
15.4%	329	4.	about one-half of the time
15.1%	324	5.	over one-half of the time
32.3%	691	6.	nearly all of the time
11.3%	241	7.	all of the time

57. *After* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

5.6%	120	1.	not at all
28.3%	607	2.	no more than 2 to 3 hours per week
26.6%	571	3.	about one-fourth of the time
15.8%	339	4.	about one-half of the time
11.4%	244	5.	over one-half of the time
10.0%	214	6.	nearly all of the time
2.4%	52	7.	all of the time

Questions 58 and 59:
How many hours *per week* did your supervising teacher spend conferring with you (excluding observations of your teaching)?

58. *During* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

12.4%	265	1.	0-1 hours
38.2%	820	2.	2-4 hours
31.7%	679	3.	5-7 hours
12.4%	266	4.	8-10 hours
5.2%	111	5.	over 10 hours

59. *After* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

21.1%	454	1.	0-1 hours
44.5%	956	2.	2-4 hours
23.0%	494	3.	5-7 hours
7.2%	154	4.	8-10 hours
4.0%	86	5.	over 10 hours

60. How frequently did you receive formal systematic feedback from your supervising teacher during your student teaching experience (e.g., videotape analysis, audio tape, written comments, checklists, ratings, etc.)?

13.4%	287	1.	every day
14.4%	308	2.	at least twice each week
11.1%	238	3.	about once each week
8.8%	187	4.	about once every other week
15.1%	323	5.	about once every 3 or 4 weeks
16.3%	348	6.	less than once every 4 weeks
20.9%	446	7.	never

Questions 61 through 65:
Considering the total student teaching experience, how often did your supervising teacher engage in the following activities?

61. Planned with you.

27.8%	600	1.	frequently
23.5%	506	2.	often
28.6%	617	3.	sometimes
15.9%	342	4.	seldom
3.9%	84	5.	never
.2%	4	6.	don't know

62. Informally evaluated your progress and activities.

25.2%	542	1.	frequently
34.5%	742	2.	often
25.5%	549	3.	sometimes
11.5%	248	4.	seldom
2.3%	50	5.	never
.9%	20	6.	don't know

63. Held casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.

44.6%	959	1.	frequently
31.2%	672	2.	often
16.8%	362	3.	sometimes
5.9%	126	4.	seldom
1.4%	30	5.	never
.1%	2	6.	don't know

64. Prepared additional reports relating to student teaching.

4.3%	93	1.	frequently
6.8%	145	2.	often
21.2%	453	3.	sometimes
23.8%	510	4.	seldom
22.6%	484	5.	never
21.3%	455	6.	don't know

65. Made contacts with you (telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.) outside of regular working hours at school.

5.5%	117	1.	frequently
7.0%	149	2.	often
28.5%	611	3.	sometimes
26.4%	565	4.	seldom
31.8%	682	5.	never
.9%	19	6.	don't know

66. How many days during student teaching did you handle classes for your supervising teacher while he was away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal or other persons, personal or private affairs outside of school) when a substitute teacher would have been hired if you had not been there?

46.5%	988	1.	none
11.3%	241	2.	less than 1 day
32.9%	699	3.	1-3 days
6.7%	142	4.	4-7 days
1.4%	29	5.	8-10 days
1.2%	25	6.	more than 10 days

67. How often did you handle other responsibilities (e.g., hall supervision, lunch duty, athletic events, chaperoning, etc.) of your supervising teacher while he was away for reasons other than student teaching business?

7.7%	164	1.	frequently
5.8%	124	2.	often
17.8%	381	3.	sometimes
21.8%	468	4.	seldom
46.9%	1004	5.	never

68. How many days did you handle classes for any teacher (other than your supervising teacher) while that teacher was away from class when a substitute would have normally been employed?

77.8%	1650	1.	none
12.0%	255	2.	less than 1 day
7.6%	161	3.	2-4 days
1.3%	27	4.	5-7 days
.9%	19	5.	8-10 days
.4%	8	6.	more than 10 days

69. Assuming that appropriate supervisory arrangements could be made, what is your feeling in regard to the use of student teachers as substitutes?

9.3%	200	1.	they should never be used
28.1%	602	2.	should be used, but only in an emergency when the supervising teacher is unavailable
46.8%	1004	3.	should be used, but as a planned educational experience
11.0%	236	4.	should be used without qualification
4.8%	102	5.	don't know

70. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the performance of your supervising teacher?

7.6%	163	1.	has made him a much more effective teacher
40.2%	863	2.	has made him a more effective teacher
27.6%	593	3.	has had no effect on his teaching
1.1%	23	4.	has made him a less effective teacher
.3%	6	5.	has made him a much less effective teacher
23.2%	497	6.	unable to judge

71. To what extent was it possible for the school to improve upon or institute additional programs as a result of your presence?

4.5%	96	1.	a great deal
26.3%	563	2.	to some extent
37.8%	809	3.	not at all
31.5%	674	4.	don't know

72. What recommendations would you give your friends about accepting a student teaching assignment in the same school?

70.2%	1494	1.	accept with enthusiasm
7.4%	158	2.	accept the school assignment, but with a different supervising teacher
14.4%	307	3.	accept
4.4%	94	4.	be neutral
2.3%	48	5.	try for a different assignment
1.2%	26	6.	reject the assignment

Questions 73 through 76:
These items deal with your experience in schools that were provided for prospective teachers by your college or university.

73. How much school experience did you have during your pre-student teaching preparation?

18.3%	391	1.	0-10 hours
11.7%	250	2.	11-20 hours
10.3%	221	3.	21-30 hours
9.7%	207	4.	31-40 hours
8.8%	187	5.	41-50 hours
5.2%	111	6.	51-60 hours
5.2%	112	7.	61-70 hours
30.8%	657	8.	over 70 hours

74. To what extent were you able to reflect these experiences in your student teaching?

30.4%	649	1.	a great deal
52.7%	1125	2.	to some extent
16.4%	349	3.	not at all

75. How adequate was your pre-student teaching public school experience?

16.6%	353	1.	more than adequate
47.9%	1015	2.	adequate
24.4%	518	3.	less than adequate
10.8%	230	4.	very inadequate

76. In your judgment, when would observations in the public school be most beneficial to a student teacher?

15.6%	333	1.	prior to student teaching only
69.2%	1478	2.	prior to and periodically during student teaching
9.3%	199	3.	periodically during student teaching
3.6%	78	4.	after student teaching
2.2%	48	5.	don't know

77. To what extent were you left in charge of classes (alone) by your supervising teacher(s)?

9.5%	203	1.	nearly 100% of the time from the beginning
14.7%	314	2.	approximately 75-100% of the time from the beginning
18.0%	385	3.	nearly 100% of the time *after* the first few weeks
23.0%	493	4.	approximately 75-100% of the time after the first few weeks
14.1%	302	5.	approximately 50-75% of the time throughout
10.1%	216	6.	approximately 25-50% of the time throughout
10.7%	229	7.	less than 25% of the time throughout

78. To what extent have you had freedom to try your own ideas and teaching approaches?

68.8%	1474	1.	as much as I wanted
27.7%	594	2.	somewhat
3.3%	71	3.	not at all

79. To what extent were you given responsibility for evaluation of your pupils while teaching at your maximum load?

53.2%	1141	1.	completely
18.0%	387	2.	partially
25.7%	552	3.	shared responsibility
3.0%	65	4.	no responsibility

80. How much help has the university supervisor provided you?

54.8%	1166	1.	all the help that was needed
18.1%	385	2.	most of the help that was needed
14.4%	306	3.	some of the help that was needed
9.1%	194	4.	little of the help that was needed
.0%	1	5.	refused requests for help
3.5%	74	6.	none of the help that was needed

81. To what extent was the university supervisor available to you and your supervising teacher?

35.6%	758	1.	very adequately
50.6%	1077	2.	adequately
10.4%	221	3.	less than adequately
3.3%	70	4.	very inadequately

82. How many times has the university supervisor of student teaching visited your classes during your student teaching?

2.9%	62	1.	not at all
25.7%	547	2.	1 or 2 times
48.3%	1027	3.	3 or 4 times
12.6%	268	4.	5 or 6 times
5.5%	117	5.	7 or 8 times
2.5%	53	6.	9 or 10 times
.7%	15	7.	11 or 12 times
.8%	18	8.	13 or 14 times
.9%	20	9.	15 times or more

83. How many total contacts have you had with the university supervisor of student teaching during your student teaching (include seminars, group meetings, interviews, conferences, visits to your school and/or classes)?

1.1%	24	1.	not at all
7.4%	157	2.	1 or 2 times
20.8%	443	3.	3 or 4 times
24.0%	511	4.	5 or 6 times
15.6%	331	5.	7 or 8 times
10.5%	223	6.	9 or 10 times
4.7%	99	7.	11 or 12 times
3.2%	69	8.	13 or 14 times
12.7%	270	9.	15 times or more

84. To what extent have your supervising teacher and/or other school personnel been helpful to you on matters not directly concerned with student teaching?

40.5%	859	1.	went out of their way to be helpful
36.8%	781	2.	helped when asked
18.4%	391	3.	no such help was needed
4.1%	87	4.	no help
.1%	2	5.	refused to help when asked

85. Given several teaching opportunities, would you accept a teaching position if offered for next year in the building or system in which you did your student teaching?

73.7%	1566	1.	yes
3.5%	74	2.	no, intend to go to graduate school
14.4%	307	3.	no, plan to live in another geographic area
3.6%	76	4.	no, for personal reasons
3.3%	71	5.	no, for professional reasons
1.5%	31	6.	no, have decided not to teach

86. Why were you assigned to this particular student teaching assignment?

59.8%	1270	1.	requested this school or area
8.3%	176	2.	requested this kind of program or project
19.9%	423	3.	had no particular preference and was placed in this assignment by college or university
7.7%	163	4.	really preferred a different assignment but was placed in this one by my college or university
1.4%	30	5.	was required to accept this assignment even though I expressed a strong preference for a different one
2.9%	61	6.	for other reasons

87. How often did administrators in the corporation to which you were assigned assist you during your student teaching experience (e.g., orientation, meetings, finding materials, counseling, etc.)?

10.1%	215	1. frequently
16.0%	339	2. often
31.9%	678	3. sometimes
22.7%	482	4. seldom
19.3%	409	5. never

88. Generally, what is your feeling about the quality of the student teaching program of your college or university?

18.8%	398	1. exceedingly high quality
38.0%	805	2. high quality
35.0%	743	3. good quality
5.1%	109	4. poor quality
.6%	13	5. extremely poor quality
2.5%	52	6. unable to judge

89. How well do you feel you were prepared to student teach prior to this experience?

18.4%	390	1. very well prepared
28.6%	604	2. well prepared
34.3%	726	3. adequately prepared
15.2%	322	4. minimally prepared
3.4%	72	5. very poorly prepared

90. In your judgment how well prepared was your supervising teacher to work with a student teacher?

50.2%	1058	1. very well prepared
23.0%	484	2. well prepared
16.1%	340	3. adequately prepared
6.0%	127	4. minimally prepared
3.4%	72	5. poorly prepared
1.2%	25	6. I am unable to judge

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many student teachers have you worked with in the last 5 years?

21.6%	441	1. 1 student teacher
14.9%	304	2. 2 student teachers
14.1%	287	3. 3 student teachers
12.5%	254	4. 4 student teachers
12.5%	254	5. 5 student teachers
6.4%	131	6. 6 student teachers
9.0%	183	7. 7-9 student teachers
5.5%	113	8. 10-12 student teachers
3.4%	70	9. 13 or more student teachers

2. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers with whom you have worked?

47.7%	969	1. 1 school
30.0%	610	2. 2 schools
13.9%	283	3. 3 schools
5.5%	111	4. 4 schools
2.1%	43	5. 5 schools
.6%	13	6. 6 schools
.0%	1	7. 7 schools
.0%	1	8. 8-10 schools
.0%	0	9. 11 or more schools

3. Which statement below best describes the community in which you teach?

12.9%	261	1.	large central city (population over 150,000)
14.0%	282	2.	large suburban community (population over 25,000)
13.2%	267	3.	small suburban community (population 25,000 or less)
23.7%	478	4.	medium sized city (population between 50,000 and 150,000
36.2%	732	5.	small city or rural area (population less than 50,000)

4. How many years of teaching have you completed including this year?

4.3%	87	1.	3 years or less
18.4%	374	2.	4-6 years
17.3%	351	3.	7-9 years
15.1%	306	4.	10-12 years
13.1%	265	5.	13-15 years
9.4%	190	6.	16-18 years
22.5%	457	7.	19 years or more

5. Which of the following best describes the highest level of your educational preparation?

.1%	2	1.	do not hold a bachelor's degree
2.8%	57	2.	bachelor's degree
11.6%	238	3.	continuing preparation beyond a bachelor's degree
51.3%	1049	4.	master's degree
33.0%	676	5.	continuing preparation beyond a master's degree
1.1%	22	6.	none of the above adequately describes my preparation

6. What is your sex?

33.3%	679	1.	male
66.7%	1361	2.	female

7. For approximately how much of the day was the student teacher assigned to you?

1.6%	32	1.	less than 20% of the day
5.1%	104	2.	21-40% of the day
9.5%	193	3.	41-60% of the day
3.6%	74	4.	61-80% of the day
79.9%	1625	5.	81-100% of the day

8. How many weeks is your student teacher scheduled in this assignment?

.7%	15	1.	5 weeks or less
9.8%	198	2.	6 or 7 weeks
40.8%	825	3.	8 or 9 weeks
24.5%	495	4.	10 or 11 weeks
9.7%	195	5.	12 to 14 weeks
14.2%	286	6.	more than 14 weeks

9. At this time, how many weeks are left in your student teacher's assignment?

9.0%	182	1.	5 weeks or more
8.2%	166	2.	4 weeks
12.2%	248	3.	3 weeks
18.5%	375	4.	2 weeks
25.1%	510	5.	1 week
26.8%	544	6.	none

10. In this assignment how much time per day was your student teacher scheduled in student teaching?

85.4%	1726	1.	full days
11.3%	229	2.	half days
3.3%	67	3.	less than half days

11. How was your student teacher placed?

73.0%	1478	1.	with one supervising teacher
9.3%	189	2.	in a team-teaching situation (two or more team teachers
17.6%	356	3.	with two or more different teachers (but not team teachers

12. Which of the following best describes the instructional setting in which the student teacher was placed for this assignment?

65.1%	1312	1.	a self-contained or conventional classroom
1.3%	27	2.	a pod arrangement
5.8%	116	3.	open space school
7.2%	146	4.	individualized instructional setting
6.3%	126	5.	team teaching
5.7%	114	6.	a flexible modular or variable scheduled program
8.7%	175	7.	a special school arrangement different from any of the above

13. What is your principal current teaching assignment?

29.3%	596	1.	primary grades
16.5%	336	2.	intermediate grades
5.4%	110	3.	all elementary grades
3.3%	68	4.	middle school
8.9%	181	5.	junior high school
31.2%	634	6.	senior high school
3.0%	61	7.	junior high/middle school and senior high
1.4%	28	8.	elementary and secondary combination
1.0%	21	9.	all grades (K-12)

14. To what extent are you certified (licensed) to teach in the areas in which you are supervising your student teacher?

98.6%	2010	1.	fully certified for all areas
.8%	17	2.	certified for over one-half of the areas, but not in all areas
.3%	7	3.	certified for less than one-half of the areas
.1%	3	4.	certified for none of the areas

Questions 15 through 18:
To what subject or teaching field are you primarily assigned? (Mark only one answer from items 15, 16, 17 and 18) *

15.	.6%	12	1.	agriculture
	3.4%	73	2.	arts and crafts
	2.2%	47	3.	biology
	2.1%	45	4.	business education
	.1%	2	5.	business administration
	.5%	10	6.	chemistry
	.8%	16	7.	distributive education
	.5%	11	8.	earth science

* Percentages reported for items 15 through 18 are based on the total number of responses to all four items. Also, a larger total N is indicated by the number of responses due to respondent error.

16.	3.8%	81	1.	home economics
	1.6%	34	2.	industrial arts
	.3%	7	3.	journalism
	5.1%	116	4.	mathematics
	3.5%	75	5.	music
	4.4%	94	6.	English
	2.2%	48	7.	foreign language
	.9%	20	8.	general science
17.	.9%	20	1.	health and safety
	.7%	17	2.	school library and audio-visual services
	7.2%	154	3.	social studies
	.6%	12	4.	speech
	.1%	2	5.	vocational business and office education
	.4%	8	6.	vocational trade and industrial education
	8.8%	186	7.	physical education
	.3%	6	8.	physics
18.	.5%	11	1.	radio and television
	.2%	4	2.	recreation
	2.9%	62	3.	kindergarten
	38.4%	823	4.	elementary
	.1%	2	5.	nursery school
	4.9%	106	6.	special education
	1.9%	36	7.	speech and hearing therapy
	.1%	2	8.	junior high school endorsement

Questions 19 through 24:
To what extent were any of the following activities with your pupils changed because of your student teacher's presence?

19. Your work with individual pupils.

24.3%	496	1.	much more than usual
32.4%	661	2.	somewhat more than usual
28.3%	577	3.	about the same as usual
9.2%	188	4.	somewhat less than usual
5.4%	110	5.	much less than usual
.2%	5	6.	don't know

20. Individual help or counseling provided your pupils during non-class hours.

8.1%	165	1.	much more than usual
24.1%	490	2.	somewhat more than usual
59.0%	1200	3.	about the same as usual
4.2%	86	4.	somewhat less than usual
1.8%	36	5.	much less than usual
2.8%	56	6.	don't know

21. Amount of small group instruction.

21.6%	440	1.	much more than usual
31.4%	638	2.	somewhat more than usual
38.1%	775	3.	about the same as usual
5.4%	110	4.	somewhat less than usual
2.9%	60	5.	much less than usual
.6%	12	6.	don't know

22. Provision for make-up work and follow-up of exams.

11.5%	231	1.	much more than usual
26.1%	524	2.	somewhat more than usual
52.3%	1050	3.	about the same as usual
3.8%	76	4.	somewhat less than usual
2.9%	58	5.	much less than usual
3.5%	70	6.	don't know

23. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.

23.2%	472	1.	much more than usual
37.9%	773	2.	somewhat more than usual
31.2%	635	3.	about the same as usual
5.2%	105	4.	somewhat less than usual
2.0%	40	5.	much less than usual
.6%	12	6.	don't know

24. Progress of students toward curricular goals.

8.8%	179	1.	much more than usual
27.0%	549	2.	somewhat more than usual
52.6%	1068	3.	about the same as usual
7.6%	155	4.	somewhat less than usual
.9%	19	5.	much less than usual
3.0%	61	6.	don't know

Questions 25 through 28:
To what extent were any of the following changed because of your student teacher's presence?

25. Supervision of non-instructional activities (bus duty, recess, playground, hallways, lunch duty, etc.).

9.0%	183	1.	much better
14.1%	288	2.	somewhat better
62.6%	1276	3.	no change
1.3%	26	4.	somewhat poorer
.1%	2	5.	much poorer
12.9%	264	6.	does not apply

26. Motivation of pupils.

9.0%	184	1. much better
34.9%	710	2. somewhat better
40.7%	829	3. no change
14.0%	285	4. somewhat poorer
1.0%	21	5. much poorer
.3%	7	6. does not apply

27. Supervision of in-class study time.

14.9%	303	1. much better
27.2%	552	2. somewhat better
37.9%	769	3. no change
8.2%	166	4. somewhat poorer
1.0%	21	5. much poorer
10.7%	216	6. does not apply

28. Maintenance of an effective learning environment.

11.1%	227	1. much better
30.0%	611	2. somewhat better
42.7%	870	3. no change
14.7%	300	4. somewhat poorer
1.0%	20	5. much poorer
.4%	8	6. does not apply

Questions 29 through 34:
How often did your student teacher make any specific contributions to the school, pupils or teachers, such as:

29. Supervise non-instructional activities (recess, lunch, gymnasium, playground, athletics, halls, etc.)?

21.6%	437	1. frequently
17.2%	349	2. often
27.2%	552	3. sometimes
13.4%	271	4. seldom
17.6%	357	5. never
3.0%	60	6. don't know

30. Bring, develop, provide or suggest any new or different instructional materials or ideas?

18.2%	371	1. frequently
26.4%	540	2. often
38.8%	794	3. sometimes
12.4%	253	4. seldom
4.0%	81	5. never
.2%	5	6. don't know

31. How often were you and others in your school able to make use of the contributions of your student teacher?

13.5%	275	1. frequently
29.6%	602	2. often
40.3%	819	3. sometimes
10.7%	217	4. seldom
3.9%	79	5. never
2.1%	42	6. don't know

32. How often did your student teacher work with (instruct, counsel, tutor) individual pupils?

27.0%	548	1.	frequently
33.7%	684	2.	often
30.3%	614	3.	sometimes
7.5%	153	4.	seldom
1.2%	24	5.	never
.3%	6	6.	don't know

33. How often did planning and conferring with your student teacher take your time so that you had less time for individual work with pupils?

1.8%	36	1.	frequently
4.0%	81	2.	often
16.7%	340	3.	sometimes
41.6%	848	4.	seldom
35.3%	720	5.	never
.6%	12	6.	don't know

34. How often was re-teaching by you necessary after the student teacher taught?

.7%	15	1.	frequently
1.9%	39	2.	often
18.0%	368	3.	sometimes
40.9%	834	4.	seldom
35.4%	722	5.	never
3.0%	62	6.	don't know

35. To what extent do you feel you and your school benefited from the presence of your student teacher?

46.8%	950	1.	a great deal
43.5%	883	2.	somewhat
4.9%	99	3.	not at all
4.8%	98	4.	don't know

36. To what extent was your student teacher able to assume the teaching load (at the maximum) of his supervising teacher(s)?

68.6%	1391	1.	80-100%
16.7%	339	2.	60-79%
9.9%	201	3.	40-59%
3.6%	74	4.	20-39%
1.1%	23	5.	less than 20%

37. At what point was the student teacher able to assume his maximum teaching load?

5.0%	101	1.	assumed the maximum immediately (first week)
31.5%	643	2.	during the first one-fourth of the experience
26.5%	541	3.	during the second quarter of the experience
27.1%	552	4.	during the third quarter of the experience
10.0%	203	5.	after the third quarter of the experience

38. How many hours per week on the average were you away from the classroom while your student teacher was teaching your assigned classes?

13.3%	269	1.	less than 1 hour
38.5%	781	2.	1-5 hours
25.8%	523	3.	6-10 hours
13.6%	275	4.	11-15 hours
6.4%	130	5.	16-20 hours
2.4%	48	6.	more than 20 hours

39. To what extent were you inconvenienced by the presence of your student teacher?

1.5%	30	1.	a great deal
23.3%	475	2.	somewhat
75.0%	1529	3.	not at all

Questions 40 through 44:
How often did you engage in any of the following additional activities during the time your student teacher was teaching?

40. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

2.3%	47	1. frequently
4.1%	83	2. often
25.9%	527	3. sometimes
22.5%	458	4. seldom
45.3%	923	5. never

41. Meeting with faculty and staff in committees or conferences.

4.3%	88	1. frequently
10.4%	212	2. often
38.3%	782	3. sometimes
23.2%	473	4. seldom
23.8%	485	5. never

42. Research, curriculum development, professional reading or writing.

12.0%	244	1. frequently
22.1%	450	2. often
37.4%	763	3. sometimes
14.9%	304	4. seldom
13.6%	277	5. never

43. Participation in supervising teacher seminars or other inservice activities dealing with student teaching.

.8%	17	1. frequently
1.1%	23	2. often
13.9%	283	3. sometimes
22.2%	452	4. seldom
61.9%	1260	5. never

44. Assisting the principal or other teachers.

5.6%	115	1.	frequently
9.9%	202	2.	often
38.0%	774	3.	sometimes
26.5%	540	4.	seldom
20.0%	408	5.	never

45. How often did your student teacher teach for other regular staff members who did not have student teachers?

1.4%	28	1.	frequently
1.3%	25	2.	often
7.0%	139	3.	sometimes
15.7%	312	4.	seldom
74.6%	1482	5.	never

46. How often did your student teacher supervise non-instructional activities (e.g., lunch duty, study halls, playgrounds, chaperoning, coaching, etc.) for other regular staff members who did not have student teachers?

3.1%	62	1.	frequently
3.1%	62	2.	often
8.9%	177	3.	sometimes
13.1%	260	4.	seldom
71.7%	1423	5.	never

47. Generally, how often were other faculty members able to visit in other classrooms or schools because of the presence of your student teacher in the building?

.6%	11	1.	frequently
.6%	12	2.	often
4.9%	96	3.	sometimes
11.6%	230	4.	seldom
81.3%	1627	5.	never

48. Generally, how often were other faculty members able to engage in research, curriculum development, professional reading, writing or committee work because of the presence of your student teacher in the building?

.9%	17	1.	frequently
.7%	14	2.	often
5.3%	105	3.	sometimes
11.8%	233	4.	seldom
81.3%	1608	5.	never

49. On how many occasions during the time your student teacher was present were you utilized to fill in for other teachers where normally, if there were not student teachers in the building, a substitute would have been called?

78.0%	1533	1.	none
9.5%	187	2.	1 time
9.3%	183	3.	2-3 times
1.9%	37	4.	4-5 times
.9%	18	5.	6-7 times
.3%	5	6.	8-9 times
.2%	3	7.	10 or more times

50. Approximately how many hours per week were you in the physical presence of your student teacher *during* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching?

5.0%	98	1.	less than 10 hours
17.2%	339	2.	11-20 hours
24.0%	474	3.	21-30 hours
39.1%	772	4.	31-40 hours
14.7%	290	5.	more than 40 hours

51. Approximately how many hours per week were you in the physical presence of your student teacher *after* the first few (1-3) weeks?

15.0%	297	1. less than 10 hours
31.9%	631	2. 11-20 hours
29.7%	588	3. 21-30 hours
17.6%	348	4. 31-40 hours
5.7%	113	5. more than 40 hours

52. How did the presence of a student teacher affect the average number of hours per week you spent at school as compared to when you did not have a student teacher?

7.7%	153	1. reduced by 1-3 hours
3.2%	63	2. reduced by more than 3 hours
72.8%	1449	3. had no effect
13.7%	272	4. added 1-3 hours
2.6%	52	5. added more than 3 hours

Questions 53 through 55:
To what extent was the time you spent on any of the following activities changed because of your student teacher's presence?

53. Teaching.

1.2%	24	1. increased a great deal
3.7%	73	2. increased to some extent
13.2%	263	3. remained about the same
46.3%	919	4. reduced to some extent
35.6%	708	5. reduced a great deal

54. Lesson planning.

4.5%	89	1. increased a great deal
14.9%	296	2. increased to some extent
27.6%	547	3. remained about the same
37.1%	737	4. reduced to some extent
15.9%	315	5. reduced a great deal

55. Paper grading.

.9%	18	1.	increased a great deal
2.7%	54	2.	increased to some extent
20.6%	406	3.	remained about the same
42.8%	843	4.	reduced to some extent
32.9%	648	5.	reduced a great deal

Questions 56 and 57:
How frequently did you observe your student teacher teach the classes?

56. *During* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching.

.8%	16	1.	not at all
4.9%	96	2.	no more than 2 to 3 hours per week
6.9%	137	3.	about one-fourth of the time
9.9%	195	4.	about one-half of the time
14.5%	287	5.	over one-half of the time
43.6%	862	6.	nearly all of the time
19.5%	386	7.	all of the time

57. *After* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching.

.9%	18	1.	not at all
11.9%	235	2.	no more than 2 to 3 hours per week
24.3%	481	3.	about one-fourth of the time
25.4%	504	4.	about one-half of the time
20.7%	410	5.	over one-half of the time
15.4%	306	6.	nearly all of the time
1.4%	27	7.	all of the time

Questions 58 and 59:
How many hours *per week* did you spend conferring with your student teacher (excluding observations of teaching)?

58. *During* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching.

5.3%	105	1.	0 to 1 hour
39.5%	783	2.	2 to 4 hours
36.0%	714	3.	5 to 7 hours
12.7%	251	4.	8 to 10 hours
6.5%	128	5.	more than 10 hours

59. *After* the first few (1-3) weeks of student teaching.

10.6%	210	1.	0 to 1 hour
51.3%	1017	2.	2 to 4 hours
28.3%	561	3.	5 to 7 hours
6.9%	137	4.	8 to 10 hours
2.9%	58	5.	more than 10 hours

60. How frequently did you provide formal systematic feedback to your student teacher (e.g., videotape analysis, audio tapes, written comments, checklists, ratings, etc.)?

19.4%	392	1.	every day
18.1%	365	2.	at least twice each week
18.4%	372	3.	about once each week
8.1%	164	4.	about once every other week
13.6%	274	5.	about once every 3 or 4 weeks
10.8%	219	6.	less than once every 4 weeks
11.6%	235	7.	never

Questions 61 through 65:
Considering the total student teaching experience, how often did you engage in the following activities because of the presence of the student teacher?

61. Planned with your student teacher.

54.1%	1101	1. frequently
31.2%	634	2. often
13.6%	276	3. sometimes
1.1%	23	4. seldom
.0%	0	5. never

62. Informally evaluated your student teacher's progress or activities.

38.7%	788	1. frequently
47.6%	969	2. often
13.0%	264	3. sometimes
.6%	12	4. seldom
.0%	1	5. never

63. Held casual and/or personal conversations not really a part of student teaching.

45.4%	924	1. frequently
32.5%	662	2. often
18.9%	386	3. sometimes
3.0%	61	4. seldom
.2%	4	5. never

64. Prepared additional reports related to student teaching.

2.4%	49	1. frequently
5.6%	114	2. often
44.6%	904	3. sometimes
35.1%	711	4. seldom
12.2%	248	5. never

65. Made contacts (telephone, conferences, social engagements, etc.) with your student teacher outside of regular working hours at school?

4.0%	82	1. frequently
6.0%	123	2. often
32.5%	661	3. sometimes
33.8%	687	4. seldom
23.4%	477	5. never

66. How many days during the student teaching experience did your student teacher handle classes for you while you were away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal or other persons, personal or private affairs outside of school) when a substitute would have been hired if the student teacher had not been there?

60.7%	1231	1. none
13.7%	278	2. less than 1 day
22.7%	461	3. 1-3 days
2.3%	47	4. 4-7 days
.2%	5	5. 8-10 days
.3%	6	6. more than 10 days

67. How often did your student teacher handle your *other* responsibilities (e.g., hall supervision, lunch duty, recess, athletic events, chaperoning, etc.) while you were away for reasons other than student teaching business?

10.0%	202	1. frequently
2.8%	57	2. often
9.4%	191	3. sometimes
17.2%	348	4. seldom
60.5%	1226	5. never

68. How many days did your student teacher handle classes for any teacher other than you while that teacher was away from class when a substitute would have normally been employed?

87.9%	1769	1.	none
8.3%	166	2.	less than 1 day
3.0%	61	3.	2-4 days
.3%	6	4.	5-7 days
.4%	8	5.	8-10 days
.1%	2	6.	more than 10 days

69. Assuming that appropriate legal supervisory arrangements could be made, what is your feeling in regard to utilizing student teachers as substitutes?

17.7%	360	1.	they should never be used
28.7%	583	2.	should be used, but only in an emergency where the supervising teacher is unavailable
50.0%	1018	3.	should be used, but as a planned educational experience and probably late in the experience
1.2%	25	4.	should be used without qualification
2.4%	48	5.	don't know

70. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on your own teaching performance?

15.9%	323	1.	has made me a much more effective teacher
68.1%	1385	2.	had made me a more effective teacher
15.6%	317	3.	had had no effect on my teaching
.3%	6	4.	had made me a less effective teacher
.0%	1	5.	had made me a much less effective teacher

70

71. To what extent was it possible for the school to improve upon or institute additional programs as a result of the presence of the student teacher?

5.8%	119	1.	a great deal
31.8%	648	2.	to some extent
45.6%	930	3.	not at all
16.7%	341	4.	don't know

72. Would you accept another student teacher with similar credentials from the same institution under the same general circumstances?

60.4%	1227	1.	would accept with enthusiasm
31.5%	640	2.	would accept
4.2%	85	3.	feel neutral about it
3.0%	61	4.	would probably decline
1.0%	20	5.	would refuse

Questions 73 through 76:
These items deal with the experiences provided for prospective teachers in schools during their preparation at a college or university.

73. How much experience did your student teacher have in school settings during the pre-student teaching training?

19.1%	388	1.	a great deal
57.9%	1175	2.	some
6.9%	140	3.	none
16.0%	324	4.	don't know

74. To what extent were these experiences reflected in the performance of your student teacher?

21.4%	432	1.	a great deal
45.1%	912	2.	to some extent
8.0%	161	3.	not at all
25.5%	515	4.	don't know

75. How adequate were the experiences the student teacher had in school settings before student teaching?

9.0%	182	1. more than adequate
44.5%	898	2. adequate
13.3%	268	3. less than adequate
7.6%	154	4. very inadequate
25.5%	515	5. don't know

76. In your judgment, when would observation in the public schools be most beneficial to the student teacher?

15.9%	323	1. prior to student teaching only
71.1%	1443	2. prior to and periodically during student teaching
7.0%	142	3. periodically during student teaching
4.2%	85	4. after student teaching
1.8%	36	5. don't know

77. To what extent was your student teacher left in charge of classes (alone)?

1.3%	27	1. nearly 100% of the time from the beginning of the experience
5.2%	105	2. approximately 75 to 100% of the time from the beginning
10.0%	204	3. nearly 100% of the time after the first few weeks
29.2%	594	4. approximately 75 to 100% of the time after the first few weeks
15.5%	314	5. approximately 50 to 75% of the time throughout
19.6%	398	6. approximately 25 to 50% of the time throughout
19.2%	389	7. less than 25% of the time throughout

78. To what extent has your student teacher had freedom to try out ideas and teaching approaches?

82.9%	1685	1.	as much as he wanted
16.6%	337	2.	somewhat
.3%	7	3.	not at all
.1%	2	4.	don't know

79. To what extent was the student teacher given responsibility for evaluation of the pupils while teaching at maximum load?

37.2%	756	1.	completely
22.3%	453	2.	partially
39.7%	807	3.	shared responsibility
.7%	15	4.	no responsibility

80. How much help has the university supervisor provided you?

70.2%	1416	1.	all the help that was needed
13.8%	278	2.	most of the help that was needed
8.8%	177	3.	some of the help that was needed
5.3%	106	4.	little of the help that was needed
.0%	1	5.	refused requests for help
1.9%	39	6.	none of the help that was needed

81. To what extent was the college supervisor available to you and your student teacher?

39.4%	801	1.	very adequately
50.3%	1023	2.	adequately
8.0%	162	3.	less than adequately
2.4%	48	4.	very inadequately

82. How many times has the university supervisor of student teaching visited your student teacher's *classes* during student teaching?

2.9%	58	1.	not at all
24.7%	498	2.	1-2 times
51.5%	1038	3.	3-4 times
13.3%	269	4.	5-6 times
4.1%	82	5.	7-8 times
2.4%	48	6.	9-10 times
.5%	10	7.	11-12 times
.3%	6	8.	13-14 times
.3%	7	9.	15 times or more

83. How many *total* contacts have you had with the university supervisor of student teaching during the student teacher's experience (include seminars, group meetings, interviews, conferences, telephone calls, visits to your school, classes, etc.)?

1.4%	29	1.	not at all
16.1%	328	2.	1-2 times
44.4%	903	3.	3-4 times
22.1%	449	4.	5-6 times
9.5%	193	5.	7-8 times
3.3%	68	6.	9-10 times
1.4%	29	7.	11-12 times
.7%	14	8.	13-14 times
.9%	19	9.	15 times or more

84. Has the university supervisor been helpful to you with any matters not directly concerned with student teaching?

20.6%	419	1.	went out of the way to be helpful
21.5%	437	2.	helped when asked
52.9%	1076	3.	no such help was needed
5.0%	102	4.	no help
.0%	1	5.	refused to help when asked

85. Would you want your student teacher to teach in your building or system next year?

79.9%	1605	1.	yes
14.0%	281	2.	no, but would recommend him in a different system or building
1.7%	34	3.	no, and would not recommend him to a different system or building
4.3%	87	4.	no

86. Why was this student teacher assigned to you?

37.3%	751	1.	volunteered from a sense of professional obligation
.9%	18	2.	volunteered because of administrator pressure
22.7%	458	3.	volunteered because of the potential assistance a student teacher offers in the performance of school duties
27.3%	549	4.	did not volunteer, but was requested by an administrator to take a student teacher
.1%	2	5.	had no choice in the matter and was required to work with the student teacher against my will
11.7%	236	6.	for other reasons

87. What do you think should be the attitude of the administrators and teachers in your school about working with student teachers?

16.8%	339	1.	should agressively seek student teachers
35.8%	720	2.	should seek student teachers
47.1%	948	3.	should accept student teachers
.2%	4	4.	should resist having student teachers in the school
.1%	2	5.	should refuse to have student teachers in the school

88. What is the optimum number of student teachers you feel you can work with each year?

7.5%	151	1.	none
36.8%	740	2.	1 student teacher
44.0%	885	3.	2 student teachers
6.4%	128	4.	3 student teachers
4.1%	82	5.	4 student teachers
1.3%	27	6.	more than 4 student teachers

89. How well was your present student teacher prepared to enter student teaching?

36.7%	742	1.	very well prepared
26.8%	542	2.	well prepared
24.7%	498	3.	adequately prepared
8.4%	170	4.	minimally prepared
2.7%	54	5.	very poorly prepared
.7%	14	6.	unable to judge

90. To what extent did you feel prepared to work with a student teacher prior to the student teacher's arrival?

31.3%	630	1.	very well prepared
36.1%	728	2.	well prepared
25.3%	509	3.	adequately prepared
6.4%	128	4.	minimally prepared
.9%	19	5.	very poorly prepared

91. Which of the following best describes your preparation to supervise student teachers?

19.0%	380	1.	had no preparation
14.8%	296	2.	attended specific graduate courses and/or workshops in supervision
25.8%	517	3.	attended inservice workshops and/or conferences on supervision
31.2%	624	4.	had only the contacts from the university supervisor
9.2%	184	5.	had specific graduate courses and attended inservice conferences on student teacher supervision

92. How much time did you spend prior to your student teacher's arrival preparing for and organizing meaningful activities for your student teacher (e.g., materials, orientation plans, administrative arrangements, etc.)?

18.0%	357	1.	1 hour or less
36.9%	731	2.	2-3 hours
24.9%	494	3.	4-5 hours
7.9%	157	4.	6-7 hours
12.3%	244	5.	8 or more hours

93. Which of the following statements best describes the prerequisites you would recommend for a teacher to become qualified to supervise student teachers?

3.0%	59	1.	no prerequisites
3.3%	66	2.	master's degree only
9.1%	179	3.	master's degree with tenure
8.8%	173	4.	master's degree with special preparation and training
25.3%	498	5.	master's degree with three years of teaching experience
30.3%	598	6.	master's degree with three years of teaching and special preparation
1.5%	30	7.	tenure only
5.5%	109	8.	special preparation and training only
13.1%	259	9.	minimum three years of teaching experience only

94. Generally, what is your feeling about the quality of the student teaching programs with which you have been cooperating?

13.8%	277	1.	exceedingly high quality
42.3%	849	2.	high quality
30.6%	614	3.	good quality
9.4%	189	4.	fair quality
1.4%	28	5.	poor quality
.4%	8	6.	extremely poor quality
2.1%	42	7.	unable to judge

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which of the following best describes you?

82.3%	608	1. building principal
6.2%	46	2. assistant building principal
.9%	7	3. department chairman
2.4%	18	4. curriculum supervisor
3.0%	22	5. assistant superintendent
3.0%	22	6. superintendent
2.2%	16	7. other

2. How many different colleges or universities have been represented by the student teachers assigned to your building/corporation in the last two years?

12.8%	95	1. 1 school
20.9%	155	2. 2 schools
23.4%	174	3. 3 schools
20.6%	153	4. 4 schools
8.6%	64	5. 5 schools
7.7%	57	6. 6 schools
2.7%	20	7. 7 schools
2.8%	21	8. 8-10 schools
.5%	4	9. 11 or more schools

3. Which statement below best describes the community in which your school is located?

14.0%	103	1.	large central city (population over 150,000)
14.8%	109	2.	large suburban community (population over 25,000)
16.0%	118	3.	small suburban community (population under 25,000)
16.0%	118	4.	medium sized city (population between 50,000 to 150,000)
39.2%	289	5.	small city or rural area (population less than 50,000)

4. For how many years have you been in your present position?

17.4%	129	1.	2 years or less
30.7%	227	2.	3-5 years
23.4%	173	3.	6-9 years
11.9%	88	4.	10-12 years
16.6%	123	5.	more than 12 years

5. How many years has it been since you were last assigned to a classroom as a teacher?

3.5%	26	1.	none, presently teaching
8.7%	65	2.	1-3 years
16.9%	126	3.	4-6 years
21.3%	159	4.	7-9 years
19.2%	143	5.	10-12 years
12.6%	94	6.	13-15 years
8.1%	60	7.	16-18 years
9.7%	72	8.	more than 18 years

6. What is your sex?

92.6%	684	1.	male
7.4%	55	2.	female

7. How many students are in your school corporation?

4.0%	30	1.	less than 1,000 students
19.8%	147	2.	1,000-2,999 students
25.5%	190	3.	3,000-6,999 students
22.4%	167	4.	7,000-14,999 students
11.3%	84	5.	15,000-29,999 students
7.3%	54	6.	30,000-39,999 students
4.7%	35	7.	40,000-49,999 students
4.4%	33	8.	50,000 students or more
.5%	4	9.	don't know

8. How many students are assigned to your building?

2.3%	17	1.	0-200 students
15.2%	113	2.	201-400 students
25.8%	192	3.	401-600 students
20.6%	153	4.	601-800 students
9.7%	72	5.	801-1000 students
4.7%	35	6.	1001-1200 students
3.8%	28	7.	1201-1400 students
8.5%	63	8.	1400 students or more
9.5%	71	9.	does not apply

9. How many teachers are assigned to your building?

11.2%	84	1.	15 or fewer teachers
34.4%	258	2.	16-30 teachers
23.2%	174	3.	31-45 teachers
9.2%	69	4.	46-60 teachers
4.5%	34	5.	61-75 teachers
3.3%	25	6.	76-90 teachers
1.9%	14	7.	91-105 teachers
3.3%	25	8.	106 teachers or more
8.8%	66	9.	does not apply

10. For what proportion of their time are the majority of the student teachers assigned to your building/corporation by their institution for student teaching?

95.2%	709	1.	full days
4.0%	30	2.	half days
.1%	1	3.	less than half days
.7%	5	4.	don't know

11. For how many years (approximately) have student teachers been assigned in the building in which you are presently the administrator?

8.1%	60	1.	3 or fewer years
14.7%	108	2.	4-6 years
13.7%	101	3.	7-9 years
14.1%	104	4.	10-12 years
11.1%	82	5.	13-15 years
6.8%	50	6.	16-18 years
2.7%	20	7.	19-21 years
18.6%	137	8.	more than 21 years
10.2%	75	9.	does not apply

12. How many student teachers are assigned to your building at the present time?

26.1%	195	1.	1 student teacher
21.4%	160	2.	2 student teachers
13.5%	101	3.	3 student teachers
9.4%	70	4.	4 student teachers
5.5%	41	5.	5 student teachers
8.0%	60	6.	6-8 student teachers
2.9%	22	7.	9-11 student teachers
3.2%	24	8.	12 or more student teachers
9.8%	73	9.	does not apply

13. Where is your present assignment?

45.3%	337	1.	elementary school
11.2%	83	2.	junior high or middle school
6.2%	46	3.	K through 8
4.8%	36	4.	combined junior high or middle school and senior high school
1.2%	9	5.	combined junior high or middle school and elementary school
20.8%	155	6.	senior high school
8.7%	65	7.	central administrative office
.8%	6	8.	in all or several schools of the corporation
.9%	7	9.	other

14. How many student teachers have you supervised as a classroom teacher?

33.4%	241	1. none
12.7%	92	2. 1 student teacher
7.9%	57	3. 2 student teachers
9.4%	68	4. 3 student teachers
5.4%	39	5. 4 student teachers
17.2%	124	6. 5-9 student teachers
6.8%	49	7. 10-14 student teachers
1.5%	11	8. 15-19 student teachers
5.7%	41	9. 20 or more student teachers

15. What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your building at any one time?

12.3%	90	1. 3 student teachers or less
33.3%	244	2. 4-6 student teachers
15.8%	116	3. 7-9 student teachers
13.9%	102	4. 10-12 student teachers
4.1%	30	5. 13-15 student teachers
7.1%	52	6. more than 15 student teachers
7.8%	57	7. does not apply
5.6%	41	8. don't know

16. What is the optimum number of student teachers you can accommodate in your school corporation at any one time?

2.7%	20	1. 5 student teachers or less
6.9%	50	2. 6-10 student teachers
6.9%	50	3. 11-15 student teachers
4.7%	34	4. 16-20 student teachers
6.9%	50	5. 21-30 student teachers
3.0%	22	6. 31-40 student teachers
19.8%	144	7. more than 40 student teachers
10.3%	75	8. does not apply
38.9%	283	9. don't know

17. Generally, how do the pupils react to having student teachers in the building/corporation?

26.8%	199	1. very positively
58.0%	430	2. positively
12.8%	95	3. neutral
1.2%	9	4. somewhat negatively
.0%	0	5. very negatively
1.2%	9	6. don't know

18. Generally, how do parents of your pupils react to having student teachers in the building/corporation?

16.9%	125	1. very positively
49.9%	370	2. positively
24.3%	180	3. neutral
3.6%	27	4. somewhat negatively
.0%	0	5. very negatively
5.1%	38	6. don't know

19. Generally, how do the custodial, cafeteria and clerical staff react to having student teachers in the building/corporation?

25.0%	187	1. very positively
49.5%	370	2. positively
22.4%	167	3. neutral
.5%	4	4. somewhat negatively
.0%	0	5. very negatively
2.5%	19	6. don't know

Questions 20 through 24:
To what extent are any of the following instructional activities for pupils changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building?

20. Individual counseling of pupils.

8.9%	66	1.	much more than usual
33.2%	246	2.	somewhat more than usual
53.4%	396	3.	about the same as usual
1.9%	14	4.	somewhat less than usual
.0%	0	5.	much less than usual
2.6%	19	6.	don't know

21. Amount of small group instruction.

20.3%	151	1.	much more than usual
50.2%	373	2.	somewhat more than usual
27.5%	204	3.	about the same as usual
.3%	2	4.	somewhat less than usual
.4%	3	5.	much less than usual
1.3%	10	6.	don't know

22. Provision for make-up work.

5.2%	39	1.	much more than usual
34.3%	255	2.	somewhat more than usual
55.9%	415	3.	about the same as usual
.8%	6	4.	somewhat less than usual
.5%	4	5.	much less than usual
3.2%	24	6.	don't know

23. Individual attention to, or tutoring of, pupils.

22.1%	164	1.	much more than usual
52.6%	391	2.	somewhat more than usual
23.0%	171	3.	about the same as usual
.7%	5	4.	somewhat less than usual
.3%	2	5.	much less than usual
1.3%	10	6.	don't know

24. Progress of students toward curricular goals.

6.2%	46	1. much more than usual
30.1%	224	2. somewhat more than usual
57.1%	424	3. about the same as usual
2.2%	16	4. somewhat less than usual
.1%	1	5. much less than usual
4.3%	32	6. don't know

Questions 25 through 28:
To what extent are any of the following instructional activities for pupils changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building?

25. Supervision of non-instructional activities (recess, study hall, gymnasium, playground, hall duty, etc.).

3.1%	23	1. much better
23.4%	174	2. somewhat better
70.8%	527	3. no change
1.3%	10	4. somewhat poorer
.0%	0	5. much poorer
1.3%	10	6. don't know

26. Motivation of pupils.

3.6%	27	1. much better
44.3%	330	2. somewhat better
45.0%	335	3. no change
3.6%	27	4. somewhat poorer
.0%	0	5. much poorer
3.5%	26	6. don't know

27. Supervision of in-class study periods.

9.8%	73	1. much better
44.8%	333	2. somewhat better
39.3%	292	3. no change
2.8%	21	4. somewhat poorer
.0%	0	5. much poorer
3.2%	24	6. don't know

28. Maintenance of an effective learning environment.

6.6%	49	1. much better
37.9%	282	2. somewhat better
46.9%	349	3. no change
6.2%	46	4. somewhat poorer
.4%	3	5. much poorer
2.0%	15	6. don't know

Questions 29 through 34:
These items deal with the contributions student teachers have made to the school program in your building. Have student teachers made any specific contributions to the school, pupils or teachers, such as:

29. Supervise non-instructional activities (recess, study halls, gymnasium, playground or hall duty)?

7.0%	52	1. frequently
16.1%	120	2. often
45.5%	340	3. sometimes
20.3%	152	4. seldom
7.8%	58	5. never
2.4%	18	6. does not apply
.9%	7	7. don't know

30. Bring, develop, provide or suggest any new or different instructional materials or ideas?

8.0%	60	1. frequently
31.6%	236	2. often
51.3%	383	3. sometimes
6.0%	45	4. seldom
.7%	5	5. never
1.6%	12	6. does not apply
.8%	6	7. don't know

31. Were you and others in your school/corporation able to make use of the contributions of student teachers?

11.4%	85	1. frequently
25.8%	192	2. often
53.2%	396	3. sometimes
5.6%	42	4. seldom
.5%	4	5. never
1.7%	13	6. does not apply
1.7%	13	7. don't know

32. Chaperone social activities for pupils?

2.0%	15	1. frequently
9.4%	70	2. often
34.8%	259	3. sometimes
24.4%	182	4. seldom
13.7%	102	5. never
14.1%	105	6. does not apply
1.6%	12	7. don't know

33. Coach or assist in interscholastic or extracurricular activities?

1.1%	8	1. frequently
9.8%	73	2. often
41.0%	305	3. sometimes
20.7%	154	4. seldom
13.5%	100	5. never
12.2%	91	6. does not apply
1.6%	12	7. don't know

34. How often was re-teaching by the supervising teacher necessary?

.1%	1	1. frequently
1.6%	12	2. often
24.5%	182	3. sometimes
53.7%	399	4. seldom
4.3%	32	5. never
2.2%	16	6. does not apply
13.6%	101	7. don't know

35. To what extent do you feel you and your school/corporation benefited from the presence of student teachers?

44.7%	333	1. a great deal
50.2%	374	2. somewhat
2.6%	19	3. not at all
2.6%	19	4. don't know

Questions 36 through 38:
These items deal with contributions student teachers may have made to the school corporation program. How frequently did student teachers assigned to your building/corporation:

36. Provide assistance in counseling students?

4.0%	30	1. frequently
9.0%	67	2. often
53.4%	397	3. sometimes
25.8%	192	4. seldom
3.6%	27	5. never
.9%	7	6. does not apply
3.2%	24	7. don't know

37. Assist in handling discipline problems?

1.6%	12	1. frequently
10.6%	79	2. often
48.3%	361	3. sometimes
30.5%	228	4. seldom
6.6%	49	5. never
.4%	3	6. does not apply
2.0%	15	7. don't know

38. Have contact or talks with parents?

2.0%	15	1. frequently
7.6%	57	2. often
47.4%	354	3. sometimes
36.4%	272	4. seldom
3.7%	28	5. never
.7%	5	6. does not apply
2.1%	16	7. don't know

39. To what extent were you inconvenienced by the presence of student teachers in your building/corporation?

.3%	2	1. a great deal
11.8%	88	2. somewhat
87.8%	654	3. not at all

Questions 40 through 45:
To what extent was the supervising teacher able to participate in the following activities as a result of the presence of the student teacher?

40. Visitation in other classrooms or schools.

8.5%	63	1.	frequently
15.0%	111	2.	often
50.4%	374	3.	sometimes
19.1%	142	4.	seldom
4.7%	35	5.	never
2.3%	17	6.	don't know

41. Meeting with faculty and staff in committees or conferences.

10.3%	77	1.	frequently
21.0%	157	2.	often
47.7%	357	3.	sometimes
17.4%	130	4.	seldom
2.5%	19	5.	never
1.2%	9	6.	don't know

42. Research, curriculum development, professional reading or writing.

2.5%	19	1.	frequently
12.5%	93	2.	often
46.1%	344	3.	sometimes
29.0%	216	4.	seldom
4.0%	30	5.	never
5.9%	44	6.	don't know

43. Work or meet with staff members of school, department or corporation.

7.2%	54	1. frequently
15.9%	119	2. often
54.2%	406	3. sometimes
18.2%	136	4. seldom
2.4%	18	5. never
2.1%	16	6. don't know

44. Assistance to the principal or to other teachers.

2.9%	22	1. frequently
13.6%	102	2. often
52.8%	395	3. sometimes
25.1%	188	4. seldom
3.3%	25	5. never
2.1%	16	6. don't know

45. Meeting with pupils in committees or conferences.

7.4%	55	1. frequently
20.9%	156	2. often
50.5%	377	3. sometimes
14.1%	105	4. seldom
2.5%	19	5. never
4.7%	35	6. don't know

46. How was the overall quality of instruction changed because of the presence of the student teachers in your building/corporation?

5.0%	37	1. much better
46.4%	344	2. somewhat better
38.0%	282	3. no change
4.6%	34	4. somewhat poorer
.5%	4	5. much poorer
5.5%	41	6. don't know

47. On the average, to what extent do student teachers in your building assume the teaching load of their supervising teachers (at the maximum)?

39.1%	292	1. 80-100%
24.8%	185	2. 60-79%
19.5%	146	3. 40-59%
9.4%	70	4. 20-39%
3.2%	24	5. less than 20%
4.0%	30	6. don't know

48. How many hours per week on the average are your teachers able to be away from their classroom while student teachers teach their assigned classes?

8.7%	65	1. less than 1 hour
37.1%	276	2. 1-5 hours
22.1%	164	3. 6-10 hours
16.4%	122	4. 11-15 hours
5.5%	41	5. 16-20 hours
2.2%	16	6. more than 20 hours
7.9%	59	7. don't know

49. How many times, on the average, were supervising teachers utilized to fill in for other teachers where normally, if there was not a student teacher in the building, a substitute would have been called?

57.3%	426	1. none
14.1%	105	2. on 1 occasion
21.0%	156	3. 2 or 3 occasions
1.9%	14	4. 4 or 5 occasions
.4%	3	5. 6 or 7 occasions
.7%	5	6. 8 or 9 occasions
.5%	4	7. 10 or more occasions
4.2%	31	8. don't know

Questions 50 through 53:
These items deal with changes in your work load brought about by the student teaching programs. Have there been any changes in your work load and what has been the cause of the changes?

50. Student teacher's assistance with routine clerical tasks in the school.

5.8%	43	1. somewhat increased work load
5.1%	38	2. increased work load
61.9%	462	3. made no change
10.3%	77	4. somewhat decreased work load
2.9%	22	5. decreased work load
11.3%	84	6. does not apply
2.7%	20	7. don't know

51. Communication with parents about activities related to student teachers.

6.6%	49	1. somewhat increased work load
7.4%	55	2. increased work load
73.0%	543	3. made no change
1.9%	14	4. somewhat decreased work load
1.1%	8	5. decreased work load
7.0%	52	6. does not apply
3.1%	23	7. don't know

52. Time of supervising teachers being made available by the student teacher's teaching of classes.

3.0%	22	1. somewhat increased work load
6.2%	46	2. increased work load
49.5%	367	3. made no change
24.0%	178	4. somewhat decreased work load
7.3%	54	5. decreased work load
6.2%	46	6. does not apply
3.9%	29	7. don't know

53. Time of other teachers being made available by student teacher's handling of some of their assigned responsibilities.

2.3%	17	1. somewhat increased work load
1.8%	13	2. increased work load
61.3%	455	3. made no change
15.2%	113	4. somewhat decreased work load
4.3%	32	5. decreased work load
10.9%	81	6. does not apply
4.2%	31	7. don't know

Questions 54 through 63:
To what extent do you feel the availability of the following university services influenced the attitude of your staff concerning working with student teachers?

54. Tuition-free university courses.

2.4%	18	1. had a very positive effect
6.6%	49	2. had a positive effect
21.8%	162	3. had no effect
.4%	3	4. had a negative effect
.1%	1	5. had a very negative effect
4.7%	35	6. this service was not available but would have had no effect
31.6%	235	7. this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
32.4%	241	8. do not know whether or not this service was available

55. University library privileges.

2.6%	19	1.	had a very positive effect
19.9%	147	2.	had a positive effect
30.8%	228	3.	had no effect
.3%	2	4.	had a negative effect
.5%	4	5.	had a very negative effect
4.5%	33	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
12.2%	90	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
29.3%	217	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

56. Faculty identification cards.

1.8%	13	1.	had a very positive effect
8.8%	65	2.	had a positive effect
28.0%	206	3.	had no effect
.0%	0	4.	had a negative effect
.1%	1	5.	had a very negative effect
11.0%	81	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
13.7%	101	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
36.5%	268	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

57. Recognition certificate from the university.

1.2%	9	1.	had a very positive effect
9.9%	73	2.	had a positive effect
23.8%	176	3.	had no effect
.4%	3	4.	had a negative effect
.0%	0	5.	had a very negative effect
11.8%	87	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
18.0%	133	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
34.9%	258	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

58. Consultant services from the university (including speaking to student, faculty and parent groups).

2.0%	15	1.	had a very positive effect
20.3%	150	2.	had a positive effect
26.7%	197	3.	had no effect
.1%	1	4.	had a negative effect
.0%	0	5.	had a very negative effect
3.5%	26	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
17.1%	126	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
30.3%	224	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

59. Instructional materials from the university.

4.2%	31	1.	had a very positive effect
31.9%	237	2.	had a positive effect
21.8%	162	3.	had no effect
.1%	1	4.	had a negative effect
.1%	1	5.	had a very negative effect
1.3%	10	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
17.0%	126	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
23.5%	174	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

60. Tickets to university events, e.g., athletics, cultural events, etc.

3.1%	23	1.	had a very positive effect
11.8%	87	2.	had a positive effect
21.4%	158	3.	had no effect
.3%	2	4.	had a negative effect
.3%	2	5.	had a very negative effect
4.6%	34	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
29.0%	214	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
29.6%	219	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

61. Cash stipend or honoraria to the supervising teacher.

25.3%	188	1.	had a very positive effect
56.8%	422	2.	had a positive effect
12.4%	92	3.	had no effect
.1%	1	4.	had a negative effect
.3%	2	5.	had a very negative effect
.0%	0	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
1.1%	8	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
4.0%	30	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

62. Seminars, workshops or meetings in your school or school area.

3.8%	28	1.	had a very positive effect
29.2%	215	2.	had a positive effect
26.2%	193	3.	had no effect
.5%	4	4.	had a negative effect
.0%	0	5.	had a very negative effect
3.9%	29	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
14.4%	106	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
22.0%	162	8.	do not know whether or not this service was available

63. Seminars, workshops or meetings on the university campus.

4.1%	30	1.	had a very positive effect
29.1%	215	2.	had a positive effect
31.4%	232	3.	had no effect
.8%	6	4.	had a negative effect
.0%	0	5.	had a very negative effect
3.8%	28	6.	this service was not available but would have had no effect
9.6%	71	7.	this service was not available but would have had a positive effect
21.2%	157	8	do not know whether or not this service was available

64. To what extent do your supervising teachers encourage student teachers to have a variety of experiences outside of the assigned classroom?

47.7%	355	1.	a great deal
47.5%	354	2.	to some extent
.9%	7	3.	not at all
3.8%	28	4.	don't know

65. How has the presence of student teachers in your building/corporation affected staff morale?

19.4%	144	1.	very positively
53.4%	397	2.	somewhat positively
24.0%	178	3.	neutral
.8%	6	4.	somewhat negatively
.0%	0	5.	very negatively
2.4%	18	6.	don't know

How many days during student teaching does the average student teacher handle classes for the supervising teacher while he is away for reasons other than student teaching business (professional work, request of principal, personal affairs outside of school) when a substitute would be hired if the student teacher were not there?

46.8%	348	1.	none
23.8%	177	2.	less than 1 day
23.4%	174	3.	1-3 days
1.9%	14	4.	4-7 days
.5%	4	5.	8-10 days
.4%	3	6.	more than 10 days
3.1%	23	7.	don't know

67. To what extent does the average student teacher handle other responsibilities (e.g., hall supervision, lunch duty, recess, athletic events, chaperoning) of your supervising teachers while they are away for reasons other than student teaching business?

3.4%	25	1.	frequently
4.8%	36	2.	often
21.8%	162	3.	sometimes
41.5%	309	4.	seldom
26.3%	196	5.	never
2.2%	16	6.	don't know

68. How many days during student teaching does the average student teacher handle classes for any teacher other than the assigned supervising teacher while that teacher is away from class when a substitute would have normally been employed?

73.5%	545	1.	none
19.0%	141	2.	1 day or less
5.0%	37	3.	2-4 days
.3%	2	4.	5-7 days
.3%	2	5.	8-10 days
.1%	1	6.	more than 10 days
1.9%	14	7.	don't know

69. Assuming that proper legal supervisory arrangements could be made, what is your feeling in regard to utilizing student teachers as substitutes?

14.9%	111	1.	they should never be used
36.0%	268	2.	should be used, but only in an emergency where the supervising teacher is unavailable
46.8%	349	3.	should be used, but as a planned educational experience and probably late in the experience
1.3%	10	4.	should be used without qualification
.9%	7	5.	don't know

70. What effect do you feel working with student teachers has had on the teaching performance of your supervising teachers?

11.3%	84	1.	has made them much more effective
75.1%	558	2.	has made them more effective
9.7%	72	3.	has had no effect
.8%	6	4.	has made them less effective
2.7%	20	5.	unable to judge

71. To what extent was it possible for the school/corporation to improve upon or institute additional programs as a result of the presence of student teachers?

3.6%	27	1.	a great deal
46.3%	344	2.	to some extent
38.2%	284	3.	not at all
11.8%	88	4.	don't know

Questions 72 through 79:
To what extent has there been any change in your work load brought about by the student teacher?

72. Counseling student teachers.

22.9%	170	1. somewhat increased work load
23.6%	175	2. increased work load
46.4%	345	3. made no change
1.2%	9	4. somewhat decreased work load
.0%	0	5. decreased work load
5.1%	38	6. does not apply
.8%	6	7. don't know

73. Finding instructional materials.

7.9%	59	1. somewhat increased work load
11.3%	84	2. increased work load
69.9%	519	3. made no change
1.9%	14	4. somewhat decreased work load
.8%	6	5. decreased work load
7.3%	54	6. does not apply
.9%	7	7. don't know

74. Finding housing and transportation for student teachers.

2.3%	17	1. somewhat increased work load
4.0%	30	2. increased work load
67.7%	502	3. made no change
.8%	6	4. somewhat decreased work load
.0%	0	5. decreased work load
23.2%	172	6. does not apply
1.9%	14	7. don't know

75. Orientation of student teachers.

26.9%	200	1.	somewhat increased work load
31.6%	235	2.	increased work load
36.2%	269	3.	made no change
.3%	2	4.	somewhat decreased work load
.3%	2	5.	decreased work load
3.8%	28	6.	does not apply
.9%	7	7.	don't know

76. Selection of supervising teachers.

20.2%	150	1.	somewhat increased work load
24.0%	178	2.	increased work load
49.3%	366	3.	made no change
.0%	0	4.	somewhat decreased work load
.1%	1	5.	decreased work load
5.4%	40	6.	does not apply
.9%	7	7.	don't know

77. Counseling supervising teachers.

22.8%	170	1.	somewhat increased work load
24.6%	183	2.	increased work load
47.3%	352	3.	made no change
.4%	3	4.	somewhat decreased work load
.1%	1	5.	decreased work load
3.9%	29	6.	does not apply
.8%	6	7.	don't know

78. Additional reports regarding student teaching or student teachers.

27.0%	200	1. somewhat increased work load
35.5%	263	2. increased work load
32.7%	242	3. made no change
.1%	1	4. somewhat decreased work load
.1%	1	5. decreased work load
3.8%	28	6. does not apply
.8%	6	7. don't know

79. Classroom visitations.

21.3%	158	1. somewhat increased work load
22.4%	166	2. increased work load
50.7%	376	3. made no change
.5%	4	4. somewhat decreased work load
.0%	0	5. decreased work load
4.6%	34	6. does not apply
.5%	4	7. don't know

80. How much help has the university supervisor provided you, the supervising teacher and the student teacher?

50.1%	371	1. all the help that was needed
27.3%	202	2. most of the help was needed
12.6%	93	3. some of the help that was needed
3.8%	28	4. little of the help that was needed
.3%	2	5. none of the help that was needed
6.1%	45	6. don't know

81. To what extent has the university supervisor of student teaching been available to you and your staff during the student teacher's contact?

26.2%	195	1. very adequately
65.4%	486	2. adequately
7.3%	54	3. less than adequately
.9%	7	4. very inadequately

82. What do you think should be the attitude of administrators and teachers in your school/corporation about working with student teachers in the future?

20.9%	155	1. should aggressively seek student teachers
41.9%	311	2. should seek student teachers
35.8%	266	3. should accept student teachers if asked
.5%	4	4. should resist the placement of student teachers in the school
.0%	0	5. should refuse to have student teachers in the school
.9%	7	6. unable to judge

83. Generally, how has the presence of the student teacher affected the professional growth of the supervising teacher?

21.1%	157	1. very positively
65.7%	489	2. somewhat positively
9.8%	73	3. neutral
.5%	4	4. somewhat negatively
.1%	1	5. very negatively
2.6%	19	6. don't know

84. Which of the following statements best describes the prerequisites you would recommend for a teacher to become qualified to supervise a student teacher?

6.8%	50	1. no prerequisites
3.9%	29	2. master's degree only
4.2%	31	3. master's degree and tenure
6.2%	46	4. master's degree with special preparation and training
28.8%	212	5. master's degree with three years of teaching experience
23.6%	174	6. master's degree with three years teaching experience and special preparation
1.2%	9	7. tenure only
10.2%	75	8. special preparation and training
15.1%	111	9. minimum three years of teaching experience only

85. Which of the following materials or services are provided to student teachers by the school or corporation?

10.9%	78	1. an orientation program
17.9%	128	2. teacher's handbook and curriculum materials
1.7%	12	3. copies of written policy statements concerning their status
7.0%	50	4. none of the above
24.4%	175	5. an orientation program, teacher's handbook and curriculum materials
2.5%	18	6. an orientation program and copies of written policy
8.8%	63	7. teacher's handbook and curriculum materials and copies of written policy statements concerning their status
19.1%	137	8. an orientation program, teacher's handbook and curriculum materials and copies of written policy statements concerning their status
7.7%	55	9. don't know

86. Generally, how were the student teachers assigned to the supervising teachers?

40.6%	298	1.	most supervising teachers volunteered from a sense of professional obligation
1.0%	7	2.	most supervising teachers volunteered because of administrator pressure
24.9%	183	3	most supervising teachers volunteered because of the potential assistance a student teacher offers in the performance of school duties
23.6%	173	4.	most supervising teachers did not volunteer, but were requested by an administrator to take a student teacher
.1%	1	5.	most supervising teachers had no choice in the matter and were forced to work with the student teacher against their will
6.3%	46	6.	for other reasons
3.5%	26	7.	unable to judge

87. How often did you assist student teachers during their student teaching assignment (e.g., orientation meetings, finding materials, counseling)?

7.0%	52	1.	frequently
14.7%	109	2.	often
54.2%	401	3.	sometimes
21.8%	161	4.	seldom
2.3%	17	5.	never

88. What is the optimum number of student teachers a supervising teacher should have in one year?

12.2%	90	1. none
49.0%	361	2. 1 student teacher
35.1%	258	3. 2 student teachers
1.1%	8	4. 3 student teachers
.7%	5	5. 4 student teachers
.4%	3	6. more than 4 student teachers
1.5%	11	7. unable to judge

89. How well prepared to student teach were the student teachers that are presently assigned to your building or corporation?

19.8%	145	1. very well prepared
40.2%	295	2. well prepared
30.7%	225	3. adequately prepared
5.6%	41	4. minimally prepared
.7%	5	5. very poorly prepared
3.1%	23	6. unable to judge

90. Generally, what is your feeling about the quality of the student teaching program(s) with which you have cooperated?

9.8%	72	1. exceedingly high quality
44.6%	327	2. high quality
37.1%	272	3. good quality
7.4%	54	4. fair quality
1.0%	7	5. poor quality
.1%	1	6. extremely poor quality
.0%	0	7. unable to judge

Appendix A

CROSS-TABULATION OF ITEMS

CROSS-TABULATION OF ITEMS

yes = items in agreement
no = items in disagreement
(-) = a slight variation
(+) = not alike, but similar
[ ] = bracketed information gives related items

Item	Student Teacher	Teacher	Administrator
1.	no	no	no
2.	no	yes	yes
3.	yes	yes	yes
4.	no	no	no
5.	no	no	no
6.	yes	yes	yes
7.	no	no	no
8.	yes	yes	no
9.	yes	yes	no
10.	yes	yes	yes (-)
11.	yes	yes (-)	yes (-)
12.	yes	yes	no
13.	yes	yes	no (+)
14.	no	no	no
15.	yes	yes	no
16.	yes	yes	no
17.	yes	yes	no
18.	yes	yes	no
19.	yes	yes (-)	no
20.	yes	yes	yes (-)
21.	yes	yes	yes
22.	yes	yes	yes
23.	yes	yes	yes
24.	yes	yes	yes
25.	yes (-)	yes	yes

Item	Student Teacher	Teacher	Administrator
26.	yes (-)	yes	yes
27.	yes (-)	yes	yes
28.	yes (-)	yes	yes
29.	yes	yes	yes (-)
30.	yes	yes	yes (-)
31.	yes (-)	yes (-)	yes (-)
32.	yes	yes	no
33.	yes	yes	no
34.	yes	yes	yes (-)
35.	yes	yes	yes (-)
36.	yes	yes	no
37.	yes	yes	no
38.	yes	yes	no
39.	yes	yes	yes (-)
40.	yes	yes (-)	yes
41.	yes	yes (-)	yes
42.	yes	yes (-)	yes
43.	yes	yes (-)	no
44.	yes	yes (-)	yes
45.	yes	yes	no
46.	yes	yes	no
47.	yes	yes (-)	no [ST, T 36]
48.	yes	yes (-)	no [ST, T 38]
49.	yes	yes	yes (-)
50.	yes	yes	no
51.	yes	yes	no
52.	yes	yes	no
53.	no	no	no
54.	no	no	no
55.	no	no	no
56.	yes	yes	no
57.	yes	yes	no
58.	yes	yes	no
59.	yes	yes	no
60.	yes	yes	no

Item	Student Teacher	Teacher	Administrator
61.	yes (-)	yes	no
62.	yes (-)	yes	no
63.	yes (-)	yes	no
64.	yes (-)	yes	no
65.	yes (-)	yes	no
66.	yes	yes	yes (-)
67.	yes	yes	yes (-)
68.	yes	yes	yes (-)
69.	yes	yes	yes
70.	yes (-)	yes	yes
71.	yes	yes	yes
72.	no (+)	no (+)	no
73.	yes (-)	yes (-)	no
74.	yes	yes (-)	no
75.	yes	yes (-)	no
76.	yes	yes	no
77.	yes	yes	no
78.	yes	yes (-)	no
79.	yes	yes	no
80.	yes	yes	yes (-)
81.	yes	yes	yes (-)
82.	yes	yes	no [T 87]
83.	yes	yes	no
84.	no	no	no [T 93]
85.	no	no	no
86.	no	no (+)	no (+)
87.	yes	no [A 82]	yes
88.	no [T 94]	yes	yes
89.	yes (-)	yes	yes
90.	yes (-)	yes	no [T 94]
91.	--	no	--
92.	--	no	--
93.	--	no [A 84]	--
94.	--	no [ST 8, A90]	--

Appendix B

SELECTED ITEMS RELATED TO STUDY QUESTIONS

SELECTED ITEMS RELATED TO STUDY QUESTIONS

What are the demographic characteristics of the respondents in the study?

Student Teacher: Questions 1-9, 11-13, 15-18, 86
Teacher: Questions 1-9, 11-14, 15-18, 86
Administrator: Questions 1-9, 11-14, 86

What are the effects of student teachers on the instructional program of the schools?

Student Teacher: Questions 19-29, 35, 71
Teacher: Questions 19-29, 35, 70, 71
Administrator: Questions 17-29, 35-38, 46, 70, 71

What are the contributions of student teachers to the schools?

Student Teacher: Questions 30, 31
Teacher: Questions 30, 31
Administrator: Questions 30-33, 65, 83

What are the effects of the presence of student teachers on the responsibilities, workloads and time of supervising teachers and administrators?

Student Teacher: Questions 33, 34, 36, 38-44, 52, 64, 70
Teacher: Questions 33-36, 38-44, 52-55, 64, 70
Administrator: Questions 34, 40-45, 47, 48, 66, 67

What are the effects of the presence of student teachers on other school personnel?

Student Teacher: Questions 45-49, 68
Teacher: Questions 45-49, 68
Administrator: Questions 39, 49, 50-53, 68, 70-79

What is the nature of the student teaching experience?

Student Teacher: Questions 8, 10, 14, 32, 37, 66, 67, 77-79
Teacher: Questions 2, 7, 8, 10, 32, 37, 66, 67, 77-79
Administrator: Questions 10, 64, 85, 87

How are student teachers supervised?

Student Teacher: Questions 50, 51, 53-63, 65
Teacher: Questions 50, 51, 56-63, 65, 92
Administrator: Questions 47, 48, 49, 64, 66-68, 72, 75, 77, 79, 85, 87

How are teacher education programs perceived by persons involved with them?

Student Teacher: Questions 73-75, 88, 89
Teacher: Questions 72-75, 85, 87, 89, 94
Administrator: Questions 89, 90

How effective are the support services which are provided by colleges and universities?

Student Teacher: Questions 80-83
Teacher: Questions 80-84
Administrator: Questions 80, 81 (54-63)

What are the implications for future teacher education programs?

Student Teacher: Questions 69, 76
Teacher: Questions 69, 76, 88, 93
Administrator: Questions 15, 16, 69, 82, 84, 88

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completion of the many phases of preparation and administration essential to this study was achieved with the cooperation of the following persons and institutions:

The Indiana Department of Public Instruction and Harold H. Negley, Superintendent; Jean Merritt, Associate Superintendent, and Anne Patterson, Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification.

Ball State University, especially the Department of Secondary, Higher and Foundations of Education.

The Indiana Association of Teacher Educators.

The members of the Steering Committee of the Indiana Student Teaching Study: Roger Boop, Butler University; Betty Collins, Indiana Central College; Patrick D. Daunt, Research Director, Ball State University; Peggy Elliott, Indiana University Northwest; William R. Norris, Purdue University; Dennis Redburn, Co-Director, Ball State University; Donald Rininger, Indiana State University; Wilma Shaffer, University of Evansville, and James A. Yutzy, Co-Director, Indiana University at South Bend.

The personnel of Indiana's professional teacher preparation programs at Anderson College, Ball State University, Bethel College, Butler University, Calumet College, DePauw University, Earlham College, University of Evansville, Fort Wayne Bible College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Grace College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State University, Indiana State University at Evansville, Indiana University, Indiana University at Fort Wayne, Indiana University at Kokomo, Indiana University Northwest, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, Indiana University at South Bend, Indiana University Southeast, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Purdue University at Calumet, St. Francis College, St. Joseph's College,

St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary's College, St. Meinrad College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, Valparaiso University and Wabash College.